

Review of biochar role as additive in anaerobic digestion processes

*Original*

Review of biochar role as additive in anaerobic digestion processes / Chiappero, Marco; Norouzi, Omid; Hu, Mingyu; Demichelis, Francesca; Berruti, Franco; Di Maria, Francesco; Mašek, Ondej; Fiore, Silvia. - In: RENEWABLE & SUSTAINABLE ENERGY REVIEWS. - ISSN 1364-0321. - STAMPA. - 131:(2020), p. 110037.  
[10.1016/j.rser.2020.110037]

*Availability:*

This version is available at: 11583/2840328 since: 2020-07-15T15:51:26Z

*Publisher:*

Elsevier

*Published*

DOI:10.1016/j.rser.2020.110037

*Terms of use:*

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

*Publisher copyright*

Elsevier postprint/Author's Accepted Manuscript

© 2020. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license  
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>. The final authenticated version is available online at:  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.110037>

(Article begins on next page)

# 1      **Review of biochar role as additive in anaerobic digestion processes**

2      Marco Chiappero<sup>a</sup>, Omid Norouzi<sup>b</sup>, Mingyu Hu<sup>c</sup>, Francesca Demichelis<sup>a</sup>, Franco

3                      Berruti<sup>d</sup>, Francesco Di Maria<sup>b</sup>, Ondřej Mašek<sup>c</sup>, Silvia Fiore<sup>a</sup> \*

4

5 <sup>a</sup> DIATI (Department of Engineering for Environment, Land and Infrastructures),

6 Politecnico di Torino, Corso Duca degli Abruzzi 24, 10129, Torino, Italy

7 <sup>b</sup> LAR Laboratory, Department of Engineering, University of Perugia, Perugia, Italy

8 <sup>c</sup> UK Biochar Research Centre, School of Geoscience, University of Edinburgh,

9 Edinburgh, United Kingdom

10 <sup>d</sup> Institute for Chemicals and Fuels from Alternative Resources (ICFAR), Chemical and

11 Biochemical Engineering Department, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada

12

13 **corresponding author:** Prof Silvia Fiore, DIATI, Politecnico di Torino, Corso Duca

14 degli Abruzzi, 24; 10129, Torino, Italy; Email: [silvia.fiore@polito.it](mailto:silvia.fiore@polito.it); Phone: +39

15 0110907613

16

## 17 **Abstract**

18 Anaerobic digestion (AD) could be considered as a mature technology and nowadays it

19 can still play a pivot role because of the urgent need to provide renewable energy sources

20 and efficiently manage the continuously growing amount of organic waste. Biochar (BC)

21 is an extremely versatile material, which could be produced by carbonization of organic

22 materials, including biomass and wastes, consistently with Circular Economy principles,

23 and “tailor-made” for specific applications. The potential BC role as additive in the

24 control of the many well-known critical issues of AD processes has been increasingly

25 explored over the past few years. However, a clear and comprehensive understanding of  
26 the connections between BC and AD is still missing. This review paper analyses and  
27 discusses significant references (review articles, research papers and international  
28 databases and reports), mostly published in the last 10 years. This review is aimed at  
29 addressing three key issues related to the better understanding of the BC role in AD  
30 processes: 1. Investigation of the influence of BC properties on AD performances and of  
31 their ability to counteract its main challenges; 2. Assessment of the optimal BC  
32 production chain (i.e. feedstock-pyrolysis-activation) to achieve the desired features; 3.  
33 Evaluation of the economic and environmental advantages connected to BC use in AD  
34 processes, compared to conventional solutions applied to address AD challenges.

35

### 36 **Highlights**

37 - Biochar key properties were specific surface, pores and surface functional groups

38 - Lignocellulosic biomass, slow pyrolysis and physical activation made the best biochar

39 - Biochar addition exhibited economic and environmental advantages

40 - Biochar improved methane production (in average 25 %) and digestate quality

41

42 **Keywords:** anaerobic digestion; biochar; bioenergy; biomass; circular economy; waste

43

### 44 **Abbreviations**

45 AD: anaerobic digestion; BC: biochar; BET: Brunauer–Emmett–Teller; CE: circular

46 economy; CEC: cationic exchange capacity; CIC: controlling internal circulation; CLSM:

47 confocal laser scanning microscopy; COD: chemical oxygen demand; DIET: direct

48 interspecies electron transfer; EAC: electron accepting capacity; EDC: electron donating

49 capacity; EU: European union; FAN: free ammonia nitrogen; FISH: Fluorescence in situ

50 hybridization; FW: food waste; GAC: granular activated carbon; GHG: green-house gas;  
 51 HRT: hydraulic retention time; IET: interspecies electron transfer; LCA: life cycle  
 52 analysis; MSW: municipal solid waste; OFMSW: organic fraction of municipal solid  
 53 waste; OLR: organic loading rate; PAH: polyaromatic hydrocarbons; PCBs:  
 54 polychlorinated biphenyls; S/I: substrate to inoculum ratio; SMP: specific methane  
 55 potential; SS: suspended solids; SSA: specific surface area; TAN: total ammonia  
 56 nitrogen; TPAD: two phased anaerobic digestion; TSS: total suspended solids; UASB:  
 57 up-flow anaerobic sludge blanket; VFA: volatile fatty acids; WAS: waste activated  
 58 sludge; WWTP: wastewater treatment plant; WV: working volume; V: volume.

59

## 60 Contents

61 Abbreviations .....	2
62 1. Introduction .....	4
63 2. Review methodology.....	7
64 3. Biochar.....	10
65 3.1. Feedstocks.....	13
66 3.2. Thermochemical production.....	14
67 3.3. Activation.....	16
68 3.4. Physico-chemical characteristics.....	17
69 4. Application of biochar as additive in anaerobic digestion.....	21
70 4.1. Buffer capacity and alkalinity.....	21
71 4.2. Adsorption of inhibitors.....	25
72 4.3. Effects on microbial populations.....	33
73 4.3.2. Selective colonization of functional microbes.....	34
74 4.3.3. Promotion of syntrophic metabolisms.....	35
75 4.4. Effect of biochar on digestate quality.....	53
76 4.5. Effects on biogas upgrading .....	56
77 4.5.1. In-situ biogas upgrading.....	56
78 4.5.2. Ex-situ biogas cleaning and upgrading.....	57
79 5. Economic and environmental assessments.....	61
80 6. Conclusions .....	68
81	

## 82 1. Introduction

83 The global energy consumption increased from around 8,800 million tonnes of oil  
84 equivalents (Mtoe, including coal, gas, oil, electricity, heat and biomass) in 1990 to  
85 14,400 Mtoe in 2018 [1]. In 2016 renewable energy sources met this demand for about  
86 14 % of primary energy supply, while fossil fuels accounted for 81% of greenhouse gas  
87 (GHG) emissions [2]. The need to decrease fossil fuel dependency and GHG emissions  
88 and to generate economic benefits is stimulating initiatives to produce energy as well as  
89 high-value chemicals and products from sustainable non-food biomass, residues, co-  
90 products and wastes.

91 Anaerobic digestion (AD) is a well-established technology for the treatment of  
92 wastewater and organic waste, e.g. the organic fraction of the municipal solid waste  
93 (OFMSW), waste activated sludge (WAS), animal manure, etc. Biogas can directly  
94 replace fossil fuels in heat and power generation or be upgraded to bio-methane as vehicle  
95 fuel or injected in the gas grid [3], while digestate can be employed as soil amendment  
96 [4,5]. Other benefits of AD, compared to alternative treatment options applied to organic  
97 waste, include control of odor and GHG emissions, removal of pathogens and adaptability  
98 to many substrates [6]. AD has been extensively implemented, from small-scale  
99 applications, particularly in rural areas and developing countries, to large-scale industrial  
100 plants [7]. Despite the rapidly growing number of biogas installations in Europe (from  
101 about 6,200 to 18,202 between 2009 and 2018) [8], many challenges regarding AD  
102 processes still persist. Different options have been explored to address these challenges:  
103 optimization of working parameters and bio-reactor configuration, co-digestion and  
104 nutrients control [9]; adoption of pre-treatments to enhance the degradability of various  
105 substrates [10,11]; use of inorganic and biological additives to support biomass

106 immobilization, supplement nutrients, mitigate inhibitors and improve process stability  
107 [12–14].

108 Among the additives, conductive carbonaceous materials, as granular activated carbon  
109 (GAC) and biochar (BC), gained interest because of their ability of enhancing methane  
110 production [15,16]. BC may present several advantages over other additives; it can be  
111 produced with a wide variety of physico-chemical properties by controlling feedstock,  
112 pyrolysis operating conditions and the activation process [17,18], resulting “tailor-made”  
113 for specific applications. In recent years, several authors confirmed the possibility of  
114 increasing methane production through BC addition (Table 1), suggesting different  
115 potential mechanisms: (1) increase of the buffering capacity of the AD system; (2)  
116 mitigation of inhibition phenomena or agents; (3) support media for biomass  
117 immobilization; (4) promotion of syntrophic metabolisms; (5) enhancement of digestate  
118 quality; (6) biogas cleaning and upgrading. The most significant and updated scientific  
119 literature investigating the BC role within AD processes can be classified as follows  
120 (Table 1):

- 121 - Studies considering the advantages of coupling AD with thermal processes  
122 (gasification, pyrolysis and hydrothermal carbonization) from a general point of view;
- 123 - Studies exploring the positive influence of BC on AD, based on methane and/or biogas  
124 production enhancement and/or improvement of digestate quality;
- 125 - Studies analysing in detail the BC features that may influence one or more of the  
126 above-mentioned mechanisms.

127 Considering the digestate, BC has been reported to enhance its quality in terms of nutrient  
128 retention, increase of the carbon-to-nitrogen ratio and reduction of nutrient leaching [19].

129 Consequently, BC doesn't need to be separated from digestate at the end of its utilization  
 130 in AD.

131

132 Table 1. Overview of literature studies exploring the connections between BC and AD

Studies considering the general advantages of coupling AD with thermal processes	Studies exploring the positive influence of BC on AD, based on a general analysis of methane and/or biogas production enhancement	Studies exploring the positive influence of BC on AD, based on a general analysis of the improvement of digestate quality	Studies analysing in details the biochar features that may influence one or more of the six above-mentioned mechanisms
Pecchi and Baratieri, 2019 [20] Fabbri and Torri, 2016 [21] Hübner and Mumme, 2015 [22] Salman et al., 2017 [23]	Linville et al., 2017 [24] Torri and Fabbri, 2014 [25] Sunyoto et al., 2016 [26] Jang et al., 2018 [27] Sun et al., 2019 [28] Zhao et al., 2015 [29] Inthapanya et al., 2012 [30] Inthapanya and Preston, 2013 [31]	Bruun et al., 2011 [32] Shen et al., 2016 [33] Shen et al., 2017 [34]	Fagbohungbe et al., 2017 [19] Ye et al., 2018 [13] González et al., 2018 [15] Zhang et al., 2018 [16] Codignole Luz et al., 2018 [35] Masebinu et al., 2019 [36] Pelaez-Samaniego et al., 2018 [37] G. Wang et al., 2018b [38] D. Wang et al., 2017 [39] Fagbohungbe et al., 2016 [40] Mumme et al., 2014 [41] Shanmugam et al., 2018 [42] Su et al., 2019 [43] Lü et al., 2016 [44] Cruz Viggì et al., 2017 [45] Li et al., 2018 [46] Martínez et al., 2018 [47] Luo et al., 2015 [48] Wang et al., 2019 [49] C. Wang et al., 2018 [50] Zhao et al., 2016 [51] Yu et al., 1999 [52] Cooney et al., 2016 [53] Dang et al., 2017 [54] Sasaki et al., 2010 [55] Martins et al., 2018 [56] S. Chen et al., 2014 [57] Pan et al., 2019b [58] Qiu et al., 2019 [59]

133

134

135 To the best of our knowledge, despite the growing number of studies investigating the  
136 connections between BC and AD, three main issues still need to be explored: a clear  
137 comprehension of the above-mentioned six mechanisms; a correlation between BC  
138 features and their effects on AD processes; environmental and economic outcomes related  
139 to BC use. The present review is therefore aimed at addressing the following issues: 1)  
140 investigation of the influence of BC properties on AD performance and of their ability to  
141 counteract its main challenges; 2) assessment of the optimal BC production chain (i.e.  
142 feedstock-pyrolysis-activation) to achieve the desired features; 3) evaluation of the  
143 economic and environmental advantages connected to BC use in AD processes, compared  
144 to conventional solutions applied to address AD challenges.

## 145 **2. Review methodology**

146 The selection of scientific literature was made considering the following criteria:

147 a) *Relevant international databases and information sources.* Bibliometric sources as  
148 Web of Science, Science Direct and Scopus were used to retrieve articles, book-chapters  
149 and proceedings of indexed conferences. Official international databases (Eurostat,  
150 International Energy Agency, European Biogas Association, etc.) were searched for the  
151 selection of technical reports and statistics;

152 b) *Chronological order.* The majority of the references in this review are from 2015 to  
153 2019 (67 %) and from 2009 to 2014 (26 %), with the balance before 2009 (7 %);

154 c) *Relevant keywords for the topics of interest.* A first survey adopted the following  
155 keywords in different combinations: “biochar, anaerobic digestion, methane, pyrolysis,  
156 economic assessment, environmental assessment, life cycle analysis, LCA”. Based on


157 this preliminary selection, the review questions have been identified. Thereby, additional  
158 keywords have been adopted to face specific issues, as: “biochar, buffer capacity,  
159 anaerobic digestion, volatile fatty acids”, “biochar, ammonia inhibition, ammonia  
160 removal, anaerobic digestion”, “syntrophic metabolisms, biomass immobilization,  
161 biochar, anaerobic digestion, DIET, electron transfer”.

162 d) *Selection of the references based on content analysis.* After a first screening  
163 considering the abstracts of all identified reference sources, 259 relevant references  
164 were analyzed as full content and included in this review. The relevant scientific  
165 content was sourced from scientific articles (240 research papers and reviews – 93 %),  
166 book chapters and indexed conference proceedings (11 documents – 4 %), and  
167 international databases and reports (8 documents – 3 %). Considering only the  
168 scientific research papers and the reviews, they were related to (Figure 1): AD (31 %)  
169 and pyrolysis (10 %); coupling AD and thermal processes (10 %); BC features (25 %);  
170 BC and AD interaction mechanisms (14 %); economic and environmental aspects  
171 related to BC use (10 %). The distribution of the relative contributes of the scientific  
172 literature to the different topics concerning the investigation of BC role in AD in 2009  
173 – 2019 exhibits a clear increasing trend due to a growing interest, particularly in the  
174 last five years, for the topics covered by the present work and consequently strengthens  
175 the need to address the above mentioned review questions.

176 This review is structured according to the contents outline. At the end of each section, the  
177 last paragraph summarizes the main findings and research gaps of the specific topic  
178 explored, which are finally condensed in the conclusions.

179

180 Figure 1. Relative contributions of the scientific literature selected for this work



181

182

### 183 **3. Biochar**

184 BC is the porous carbonaceous solid residue of the complex physical and chemical  
185 phenomena simultaneously occurring during the thermochemical treatment of raw  
186 biomass [60–63]. While AD is particularly suitable to produce biogas and digestate from  
187 wet organic waste (Figure 2), pyrolysis is a thermochemical process able to convert solid  
188 dry biomass in an oxygen-limited environment into valuable liquid chemicals (bio-oil),  
189 as well as gaseous biofuels and charcoal (biochar, BC) [64–67]. Although pyrolysis was  
190 conventionally mostly focusing on the production of liquid biofuels from woods and  
191 purpose-grown energy crops, the most recent studies found that it is not cost effective  
192 unless the feedstock is inexpensive, dry and readily available, and there are valuable  
193 chemical co-products (liquid bio-oil and solid BC) or favorable government policies [68].  
194 Both AD and pyrolysis can contribute to fulfill Circular Economy targets, but research  
195 on biological and thermochemical processes traditionally progressed along parallel and  
196 separate pathways, often in competition.


197 In recent years, improved understanding of the characteristics of bio-oil and BC has  
198 helped to develop key quality requirements to expand their potential value [69]. High  
199 value liquid bio-oil products can be obtained from the pyrolysis of biomass residues, such  
200 as phenolic substitutes for adhesives or antioxidants [70,71]. However, there are  
201 limitations: the most valuable chemicals are usually mixed with impurities that impair  
202 their properties. Similarly, there are many promising applications for BC, such as soil  
203 improver [18], composite materials [72], activated carbon [73], electrodes for batteries or  
204 electrolysis cells [74], metallurgical coke substitute [75], catalyst for tars [76], and could  
205 be eligible for carbon credits [77]. The efficiency of BC in most applications significantly

206 depends on its physico-chemical properties and elemental composition, which are subject  
207 to variations depending on feedstock, pyrolysis conditions, pre- and post-processing  
208 treatments.

209 The characteristics of AD and pyrolysis processes and products may offer interesting  
210 opportunities for the integration of such technologies (Figure 2), with the objective of  
211 contributing to the Circular Economy. For example, pyrolysis could be utilized to convert  
212 dewatered digestate into BC, which could then be used for a variety of applications  
213 [17,78,79], including its potential use to improve the quality of biogas and digestate [37],  
214 or to reduce instabilities and inhibition in digestors [16,24]. On the other hand, the acetic  
215 acid-rich aqueous pyrolysis condensate could be utilized as a feedstock for AD, possibly  
216 with the addition of BC for the selective adsorption of toxic inhibitors [21–23,25,80–88].  
217 In conclusion, BC represents the key link between pyrolysis and AD and, consequently,  
218 in this section we wish to review its characteristics, including suitable feedstocks,  
219 production technologies, activation processes and characterization techniques.

220

221 Figure 2. Outline of potential integrations between anaerobic digestion and pyrolysis (derived from [20,21]).



222

223

### 224 3.1. Feedstocks

225 During thermal processing under oxygen free or oxygen-limited conditions (as pyrolysis),  
226 as the temperature increases, the polymeric components of lignocellulosic biomass crack  
227 and liquid intermediate phases are formed with different visco-elastic behaviors [89,90];  
228 under slow progressive heating, cellulose remains hard and elastic up to 400 °C, whereas  
229 hemicellulose softens within a relatively narrow temperature range (230 to 280 °C) and  
230 remains viscous, while lignin softens and bubbles over a broader temperature range (150  
231 to 350 °C) and remains mainly elastic. The overall process cannot be simply designed  
232 based on the linear combination of the behaviors of the individual components, but it is  
233 the result of their interactions at different temperatures and it is catalyzed by the mineral  
234 matter present in the ashes. As the temperature increases over these ranges, the  
235 depolymerized liquid undergoes two competitive processes, oligomer evaporation and  
236 crosslinking reactions, with the former favored at high heating rates, and the latter under  
237 slow pyrolysis. These findings explain why, under slow pyrolysis, the char yield is  
238 greater, and the particles globally keep the same macro-structure of the original biomass,  
239 although forming an intermediate soft material. Montoya et al. (2017) [91] confirmed the  
240 presence of molten liquid intermediates formed from cellulose, xylan and lignin and  
241 showed that the presence of minerals prevents the complete liquefaction of the xylan,  
242 therefore contributing to the preservation of the general shape and structure of the solid  
243 material during pyrolysis.

244 Therefore, BC can be produced from a wide range of lignocellulosic materials, containing  
245 cellulose, hemicellulose (xylan), lignin, small quantities of other organic compounds  
246 (phenols, phytosterols and fats) and inorganics (P, N, S, Si, alkali and alkaline earth  
247 metals and traces of other minerals). Such materials include wood, agricultural and forest

248 residues, food waste, sugars, industrial organics, sewage sludge and manure. BC can be  
249 mesoporous or microporous depending on the operating conditions employed for its  
250 production and on the feedstock.

### 251 3.2. *Thermochemical production*

252 Recent reviews illustrated the different technologies and processes used experimentally  
253 and industrially to produce BC [17,92]. These include torrefaction, pyrolysis,  
254 gasification, combustion and hydrothermal carbonization [93]. Scale and potential  
255 mobility are important considerations in relation to the feedstock supply, logistics,  
256 seasonality, further refining, of products quantities, characteristics and value, and  
257 potential markets [17,60].

258 *Torrefaction* involves biomass treatment at atmospheric pressure and within a  
259 temperature range of 200–300 °C, without oxygen or with limited oxygen supplies [94].  
260 As discussed earlier, partial depolymerization and liquefaction of the biomass  
261 components take place reducing the biomass tenacity and improving grindability.  
262 Torrefaction produces char with less moisture, higher energy density, lower weight, lower  
263 O/C and H/C ratio, increased hydrophobic nature and resistance to biological degradation  
264 with respect to the original feedstock. Typical yields of torrefied biomass range between  
265 50 and 80 % [95].

266 *Gasification* is a thermochemical process carried out at temperatures higher than 750 °C  
267 in the presence of a gasifying agent (air, oxygen, or steam) at atmospheric or at high  
268 pressures. Under these conditions, biochar yields are not sufficiently significant to  
269 consider gasification an appropriate BC production process. Similarly, combustion is not  
270 a suitable BC production process, since, under good combustion conditions, BC yield  
271 should be negligible.

272 The various modes of *pyrolysis* include slow, intermediate, fast, flash, and ultra-pyrolysis,  
273 carried out under vacuum, atmospheric pressure or under pressure [65,69]. As a result of  
274 the balance between primary, secondary cracking and recombination reactions, bio-oil  
275 yields are typically maximized (up to 70 %) at intermediate temperatures (450-550 °C),  
276 faster heating rates (100-500 °C/s) and short vapor residence times (< 1~2 s), which are  
277 characteristic of fast and flash pyrolysis. Under these conditions, BC yields are typically  
278 of the order of 15~20 %. On the other hand, higher BC yields (25~40 %) are achieved at  
279 moderate temperatures (300-450 °C), slower heating rates (~ 1 °C/s) and longer vapor  
280 residence times (> 5~10 s), representative of slow or intermediate pyrolysis, when bio-oil  
281 yields vary between 40 and 50 % with the balance being gas.

282 *Hydrothermal carbonization (HTC)* is performed on wet biomass (moisture > 10 %) as  
283 feedstock, making the process highly energy-intensive [96]. HTC happens under water in  
284 a sealed confined system and heated at the temperature range of 175–300 °C for up to 16  
285 h under saturated pressure under subcritical conditions producing tar-free BC (hydrochar)  
286 with large number of functional groups [97–99]. Hydrochars are usually obtained at  
287 yields of 20-25 % [96], and they contain mainly aliphatic compounds and more oxygen  
288 functional groups and higher cation exchange capacity than conventional BC. On the  
289 other hand, they have lower surface area, microporosity and carbon stability [96,100].

290 Among the various thermal technologies, pyrolysis has been the most investigated  
291 technique and it is considered the best technology for the production of BC [101] from  
292 relatively dry feedstock (moisture content below 10 %). However, also HTC is gaining  
293 interest to produce hydrochar, particularly from wet biomass [96]. In a comparison  
294 between the chars, it should be noticed that BC yields are higher, as well as porous  
295 structure and aromatics and ash contents, while hydrochar exhibits a non-porous

296 structure, lower fixed and total carbon contents and higher amounts of alkyl functional  
297 groups [96].

### 298 3.3. *Activation*

299 BC with different properties can be produced from a wide range of feedstock and by  
300 adjusting processing conditions. Further modification of BC chemical and physical  
301 properties can be achieved through a process defined “activation”, aimed at increasing  
302 BC porosity and modifying its pore size distribution (Figure 3), as well as to some extent  
303 surface chemistry. Activation can be carried out in a number of ways, depending on type  
304 of activation agents (e.g. physical and chemical activation) or mode of operation into  
305 single-stage or multi-stage activation.

306 *Chemical activation* utilizes chemical agents, e.g.,  $H_3PO_4$ ,  $HNO_3$ ,  $KOH$ ,  $NaOH$ ,  $H_2SO_4$ ,  
307 and  $ZnCl_2$  [102,103]. It typically involves two steps; in the first the feedstock is  
308 impregnated with a selected chemical agent, and then thermally treated in the second step.  
309 Another option is the activation of already produced BC by soaking it in a chemical agent,  
310 followed by a thermal treatment. Depending on the agent selected and thermal treatment  
311 conditions used, different degrees of activation can be achieved. The activated BC needs  
312 to be thoroughly washed with deionized water to neutralize its pH and to remove any  
313 remaining chemicals [104], and this procedure can contribute to a negative environmental  
314 impact of the technology. Oxidative activation that uses acidic or alkaline agents is among  
315 the most common activation methods. Besides enhancing porosity and surface area, it  
316 also creates oxygen-containing functional groups on the surface of BC (e.g. carboxyl,  
317 hydroxyl, lactone, phenol, carbonyl, and peroxide groups). These functional groups play  
318 an essential role in different applications of BC, such as for contaminant removal or  
319 nutrient sorption.

320 *Physical activation* does not utilize chemicals, thus avoiding some of the negative  
321 environmental impacts that can be associated with chemical activation. Instead, BC is  
322 exposed to physical oxidizing agents, such as steam, CO<sub>2</sub>, ozone or air/O<sub>2</sub>, typically at  
323 temperatures above 700 °C. These gaseous agents penetrate the internal structure of BC  
324 gasifying the carbon atoms, which results in opening and widening of pores [105].  
325 Similarly to chemical activation, physical activation not only enhances BC porosity, but  
326 also modifies its surface functional groups, increasing the abundance of oxygen  
327 functional groups [105].

328 In conclusion, both chemical and physical agents can be used effectively to activate BC  
329 and obtain high porosity, surface areas over 1000 m<sup>2</sup>/g, and modified surface functional  
330 groups, tuned to specific applications. The key challenges of BC activation are without  
331 any doubt related to their potential negative environmental impacts, mainly for chemical  
332 activations, and high-energy intensity need.

### 333 3.4. *Physico-chemical characteristics*

334 The variability of BC physico-chemical properties resulting from the proper selection of  
335 feedstock, pyrolysis and activation can be adapted to a wide range of applications.

336 *Specific surface area* (SSA), expressed as m<sup>2</sup>g<sup>-1</sup>, is the ratio between the total surface area  
337 and the total particle mass of BC [106], commonly determined by Brunauer–Emmett–  
338 Teller (BET) analysis. The reported SSA values of BC can vary significantly, in the range  
339 10<sup>0</sup> - 10<sup>2</sup> m<sup>2</sup>g<sup>-1</sup> [107,108] depending on pyrolysis temperature and feedstock, and up to  
340 over 10<sup>3</sup> m<sup>2</sup>g<sup>-1</sup> after activation. SSA is a key parameter enhancing the adsorption capacity  
341 of BC, even if the chemical composition of its surface is determinant in the interactions  
342 with other species [109]. SSA is related to BC pore size distribution [18].

343 *Porosity* can be described by the pore volume ( $\text{m}^3\text{g}^{-1}$ ) and by the pore size distribution,  
344 including micro-, meso-, and macro-pores (respectively  $< 2\text{nm}$ ,  $2\text{-}50\text{ nm}$ ,  $>50\text{ nm}$ ) [110],  
345 based on their internal diameters. The relative abundance of these pores produces  
346 different BC structures (Figure 3), since micro-pores have the major contribute to BC  
347 surface area, micro- and meso-pores are essential for its adsorption capacity, while macro-  
348 pores can provide an appropriate habitat for microorganisms [18,111]. Yin et al. (2017)  
349 [112] stated that within a proper range, a high temperature results in a large surface area  
350 and pore formations. Trigo et al. (2016) [113] found that SSA increased between  $350^\circ\text{C}$   
351 and  $700^\circ\text{C}$  for different hardwood biochars, while Chen et al. (2014) [114] revealed an  
352 enhanced porous structure of BC from sewer sludge varying the temperature from  $500^\circ\text{C}$   
353 to  $900^\circ\text{C}$ .

354 Specifically considering the effect of the feedstock on BC characteristics [101], yields  
355 and aromatic functional groups are much higher from lignin (48.8 %) than from  
356 hemicellulose (21.1 %), while no differences were found in the elemental composition of  
357 resulting BCs. High lignin and mineral content in the feedstock result in higher yields of  
358 BC [115,116]. Woody and grassy biomasses generate a more carbon-rich BC when  
359 compared to sewage sludge and manure [32,117,118]. Specifically considering the effect  
360 of pyrolysis process on BC characteristics [119], increasing pyrolysis temperature  
361 decreased concentrations of aliphatic carbons, oxygenated functional groups, nitrogen,  
362 oxygen and hydrogen. However, carbon mass fraction, micropore volume, ash content,  
363 fixed carbon and carbon stability increase with higher pyrolysis temperatures.

364

365 Figure 3. SEM micrographs of (A) raw biomass (eucalyptus) and of derived (B) biochar and (C) physically activated biochar (Courtesy of  
366 the authors. The samples were produced at ICFAR and analysed at Politecnico di Torino).

367

368

369


370

371

372

373

374



375

376

377 BC *composition* is mainly of C, H, O, N, and S, along with mineral trace components,  
378 such as K, Ca and Mg, varying according to pyrolysis conditions and feedstock [110].  
379 The mineral content can be enhanced by increasing the temperature of pyrolysis [107].  
380 The *cationic exchange capacity* (CEC) of BC can be defined as its ability of absorbing  
381 and attracting cations (nutrients and heavy metals) decreasing with higher pyrolysis  
382 temperature [18]. A high CEC value is due to a negative surface charge of BC. The  
383 presence of *surface functional groups* such as hydroxyl, carboxylic, and amino, expressed  
384 respectively as atomic ratio of H/C, O/C, and N/C (generally studied by Fourier transform  
385 infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy), mostly depends on the feedstock and it is reduced with a  
386 higher temperature of pyrolysis [107]. Further, the H/C ratio is considered as a measure  
387 of the degree of aromatization of BC and the O/C ratio as an indication of more  
388 oxygenated functional groups, contributing to high CEC values and hydrophilicity of BC  
389 [120,121]. An increase in pyrolysis temperature has been reported to negatively affect the  
390 amount of acidic functional groups and the CEC [112,122].

391 *pH values* are generally basic and increase as the pyrolysis temperature grows, due to the  
392 volatilization of acidic functional groups and to the higher ash content [18]. Moreover,  
393 BC can present redox characteristics, being able to donate and accept electrons, and these  
394 tendencies are quantified respectively by the *electron donating* and *accepting capacities*  
395 [110]. Phenolic groups may be the electron donating species, while quinones and  
396 polycondensed aromatic structures the electron accepting compounds [110,123]. In  
397 addition, the *electrical conductivity*, expressed as  $S\ m^{-1}$ , decrease as consequence of the  
398 increase of the pyrolysis temperature [17].

399 A full characterization of BC involves several analytical methods [124]. Scanning  
400 electron microscopy (SEM) is employed to investigate the superficial structure of BC, as

401 well as its chemical composition if coupled with energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy  
402 (SEM-EDX); transmission electron microscopy (TEM) allows to observe BC bulk  
403 structure; X-ray diffraction (XRD) analysis detects the crystalline phases; nuclear  
404 magnetic resonance (NMR) spectroscopy investigates BC composition, specifically the  
405 aromatic structure; X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) quantitatively analyses the  
406 superficial composition.

#### 407 **4. Application of biochar as additive in anaerobic digestion**

##### 408 *4.1. Buffer capacity and alkalinity*

409 The volatile fatty acids (VFAs) produced as intermediates during AD tend to lower the  
410 pH [125]. This effect is generally counteracted by syntrophic acetogens and methanogens  
411 microorganisms, which convert VFAs to methane and carbon dioxide [126]. However, in  
412 case of high organic loads of easily biodegradable wastes (i.e. when the VFAs production  
413 rate exceeds the consumption rate), the accumulation of VFAs can occur, resulting in pH  
414 drop and even in the failure of AD [126,127]. The buffer capacity in a digester is linked  
415 to the ability to neutralize VFAs, and it is considered a rate-limiting step in AD processes  
416 [38,39,128]. The buffer capacity is determined by the alkalinity of the AD system, mainly  
417 in the form of carbon dioxide and bicarbonate [6,125]. So it is technologically challenging  
418 to build a bioreactor aimed at digesting easily biodegradable feedstock with high pH  
419 buffer capacity [16]. Even if several methods have been proposed (Table 2) so far, the  
420 most diffused solution to improve buffer capacity implemented both at lab [129] and full  
421 scale [130] is co-digestion. In particular, manure or sewage sludge showed high buffer  
422 capacity, mainly due to the quite high ammonia content, which is able to counteract the

423 pH drop due to VFAs production. Therefore, manure or sewage sludge are often co-  
 424 digested with OFMSW and/or agricultural waste biomass.

425

426 Table 2. Advantages and disadvantages of conventional methods for creating buffering  
 427 capacity in bioreactors

Methods	Advantages	Disadvantages
Alkaline pretreatment [131]	Cellulose more available to the enzymes	Expensive and considered as the technological bottleneck
Commercial alkaline materials (e.g. NaOH and CaCO <sub>3</sub> ) [132,133]	Easy pH adjustment	pH continually should be analyzed Temporary Lower biogas output at higher organic loads
Co-digestion [16]	Increasing methane yield Low cost and green	Hard to achieve an appropriate mixture of feedstocks to limit VFAs production
Geopolymer (Composite and monolith) [132,133]	Controllable alkali leaching Prevent the need for continuous pH adjustment	25 g L <sup>-1</sup> costs around 0.10 \$


428

429 However, it still remains a great challenge to develop simple, permanent and cost-  
 430 effective methods to improve buffer capacity of AD systems. Nowadays, BC is  
 431 considered as an attractive alternative to the aforementioned methods for two important  
 432 reasons. Firstly, it can be produced via cost-effective and environmentally friendly  
 433 approaches. Secondly, its physical and chemical properties can be matched with the  
 434 operational conditions [19,40,41].

435 BC's buffer capacity mainly depends on two factors:

436 I. *Functional groups*: Rapid accumulation of VFAs during AD process results in a  
 437 medium with low pH value in which some functional groups of BC like amine  
 438 adsorbs H<sup>+</sup> and accepts electron. This phenomenon could mitigate the sudden pH  
 439 drop.

440 II. *Inorganic materials*: Ash portion of biochar contains inorganic materials such as Ca,  
441 K, Mg, Na, Al, Fe, Si and S. Among them, alkali and alkaline earth metals (AAEMs)  
442 are responsible for alkalinity of biochar via reaction 1 (Ca and C<sub>x</sub>H<sub>x</sub>COOH are  
443 selected as representative of AAEMs and VFAs, respectively) [16]:



445 Table 3 shows the literature data related to BC buffering capacity and its effects on bio-  
446 methane production, showing total alkalinity, pH values and the increase in CH<sub>4</sub>  
447 production (%), ranging from 8 % up to about 26 %. Some studies suggest that the  
448 alkalinity of BC due to AAEMs in ash fraction could effectively contribute to the  
449 buffering capacity of AD against VFAs inhibition. Jang et al. (2018) [27] investigated the  
450 effects of BC from dairy manure on AD of dry dairy manure at 20°C, 35°C, and 55°C. In  
451 each case they observed a lower total VFAs concentration and increased methane  
452 production. They suggested the role of high nutrients (9.1% Ca, 3.6% Mg, 1.3% N, 0.14%  
453 P) and alkalinity potential of BC in enhancing methane production. Wang et al. (2017)  
454 [39] investigated the role of BC from vermicompost on the buffering capacity of AD of  
455 high organic loads of kitchen waste and chicken manure. The authors proved the high  
456 buffer capacity of vermicompost BC to different short-chain VFAs (700-3800 mg L<sup>-1</sup>),  
457 probably due to the presence of AAEMs and superficial functional groups. Linville et al.  
458 (2017) [24] studied the effects of BC from walnut shell during the AD of FW in  
459 mesophilic and thermophilic conditions. They observed that BC improved process  
460 stability by enhancing the total alkalinity from 2800 to 4800-6800 mg L<sup>-1</sup> CaCO<sub>3</sub> and pH  
461 (initial pH >8) in BC amended digesters. Wei et al. (2020) [134] found enhanced methane  
462 production and solids removal by adding BC from corn stover (rich of alkaline earth  
463 metals) to AD of primary sludge. The authors observed higher total alkalinity (3500-4700

464 mg L<sup>-1</sup> CaCO<sub>3</sub>) and pH in BC amended reactors, suggesting that BC provided a strong  
465 buffering capacity. Ambaye et al. (2020) [135] investigated the role of BC from sewage  
466 sludge on the AD of fruit waste. They observed that the BC addition enhanced methane  
467 production and VFAs degradation. Further, the deficiency of some nutrients or trace  
468 elements in the substrate may cause an increase of VFAs inducing inhibition of microbial  
469 activity during AD [33,135]. Extra doses of trace metals may be required for an effective  
470 activity of methanogens without VFAs accumulation [136]. Thereby, it could be  
471 speculated that BC could provide adequate concentrations of trace metals for the stability  
472 of the AD system [135].

473 In summary, BC addition can counteract VFAs inhibition in case of high loads of easy  
474 degradable wastes such as FW, OFMSW, primary sludge. The alkaline nature of BC  
475 determining its pH buffering capacity may contribute to prevent VFAs inhibition. The  
476 ash fraction of BC contains AAEMs possibly contributing to its acid-buffering capacity  
477 and important trace elements for microorganisms. However, further investigations are  
478 required to confirm the effectiveness of these mechanisms and to identify the optimal  
479 dose of BC related to these properties. Higher doses can be toxic for AD [24,134], perhaps  
480 due to inhibitory concentrations of alkali metals [137]. Besides, other mechanisms could  
481 be responsible of BC role in alleviating VFAs inhibition. Porous BC could provide  
482 support for biofilm growth and protection to selectively enriched functional microbes  
483 closely attached to it under acid stress [48]. Secondly, BC could promote the activity of  
484 microbial partners enhancing the syntrophic VFAs degradation and methane production  
485 under high organic loads [38,138]. The latter microbial mechanisms will be fully adressed  
486 in section 4.3.

487

488 Table 3. Results of pH drop and CH<sub>4</sub> production/yield of AD processes in the presence  
489 of various types of BCs

Pyrolysis Operational condition				AD Operational conditions				Results of buffering effect				Ref	
Temp (C°)	Time (min)	Reactor	Feedstock	Temp (C°)	HRT or duration (d)	Substrate	inoculum	Total alkalinity (g L <sup>-1</sup> CaCO <sub>3</sub> )		pH			Increase in CH <sub>4</sub> (%)
								Control	BC	Control	BC		
350	180	Muffle furnace	dairy manure	20	35	dairy manure	Anaerobic sludge	1.8-4.8	5.3-7.3	7.18	7.71	26.47 <sup>a</sup>	[27]
350	180	Muffle furnace	dairy manure	35	35	dairy manure	Anaerobic sludge	1.8-4.8	5.3-7.3	7.09	7.68	24.90 <sup>a</sup>	[27]
350	180	Muffle furnace	dairy manure	55	35	dairy manure	Anaerobic sludge	1.8-4.8	5.3-7.3	7.12	7.55	24.69 <sup>a</sup>	[27]
500	120	Tube furnace	vermi-compost	35	50	chicken manure	Anaerobic sludge	6.0	7.3	7.0-7.1	7.8-8.0	N.P.	[39]
500	120	Tube furnace	vermi-compost	35	50	kitchen waste	Anaerobic sludge	0.0	2.3	3.5-3.7	4.7-4.9	N.P.	[39]
600	120	Kiln	corn stover	55	15	primary sludge	Anaerobic sludge	2.8	3.5-4.7	7.2	7.6-8.0	8.6-17.8 <sup>a</sup>	[134]
350	15		sewage sludge digestate	37		fruit waste	Anaerobic sludge	N.P.	N.P.	4.5-5	7-8	13-27 <sup>a</sup>	[135]
550	15		sewage sludge digestate	37		fruit waste	Anaerobic sludge	N.P.	N.P.	4.5-5.5	7-8.6	12-22 <sup>a</sup>	[135]
500	120	Slow pyrolysis	rice straw	35	25	Municipal solid waste	Anaerobic sludge			7.8	7.5	11.69 <sup>a</sup>	[139]

a) CH<sub>4</sub> Yield; N.P.: Not provided.

490

491

#### 492 4.2. Adsorption of inhibitors

493 Inhibition is often defined as the predominant cause of reduction of bio-methane yields  
494 and instability of AD processes. A substance can be identified as “inhibitor” when it  
495 determines an adverse shift in the microbial population or arrests of the bacterial growth  
496 [137]. There are direct inhibitors, such as metals (Cu<sup>2+</sup>, Zn<sup>2+</sup>, Cr<sup>3+</sup>, Cd, Ni, Pb<sup>4+</sup>, Hg<sup>2+</sup>,  
497 Na<sup>+</sup>, K<sup>+</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup>, Ca<sup>2+</sup>, Al<sup>3+</sup>), organic compounds (chlorophenols, halogenated aliphatics,  
498 pesticides, antibiotics, lignocellulose hydrolysate); and indirect inhibitors, such as VFAs,  
499 long-chain fatty acids, hydrogen, ammonium and sulphides [19]. Among the inhibitors,  
500 ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub> or free ammonia nitrogen, FAN) and ammonium (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>) concentrations  
501 are considered crucial (ammonia and ammonium are together considered as total  
502 ammonia nitrogen, TAN). The optimal control of ammonia and ammonium may ensure  
503 stable bacterial growth and significantly contribute to the buffer capacity of the AD

504 system. However, excess FAN/TAN concentrations are major causes of AD failure  
505 [140,141]. Chen et al. (2008) [137] reported a wide range of TAN concentrations  
506 (between 1.7 and 14 g L<sup>-1</sup>) causing a 50 % reduction in methane production. FAN  
507 concentration is considered the main cause of inhibitions for methanogens [140,142] and  
508 it was reported to have a toxic effect to anaerobes ranging from 150 to 1200 mg L<sup>-1</sup>  
509 [143,144]. Various mitigation strategies have been investigated to effectively counteract  
510 TAN/FAN inhibitory effects on AD. Some were based on the removal and  
511 immobilization of the inhibitor, as: dilution, co-digestion and microbial adaptation [145–  
512 147]; struvite precipitation [148]; use of a microbial desalination cell [149]; ammonia  
513 stripping [150]. An alternative approach is based on the use of adsorbents, inorganic as  
514 zeolites [142] and organic as GAC [143] and BC [41].

515 Based on several studies focusing on BC impacts on AD and ammonia inhibition (Table  
516 4), it seems that BC could effectively mitigate ammonia inhibition, resulting in reduced  
517 lag phase and enhanced methane production respect to control reactors. Some authors  
518 [33,34,151] promoted BC use in AD of sewer sludge. Mumme et al. (2014) [41] revealed  
519 that BC from pyrolysis of paper sludge and wheat husks could limit mild ammonia  
520 inhibition (2.1 g TAN kg<sup>-1</sup>). Su et al. (2019) [43] stated that the addition of BC may  
521 alleviate inhibition in case of up to 1500 mg L<sup>-1</sup> ammonia-N in food waste AD [152]. Lü  
522 et al. (2016) [44] revealed that BC can support AD under high ammonium stress (up to 7  
523 g-N L<sup>-1</sup>). The above-mentioned studies suggest a positive effect of BC towards ammonia  
524 inhibition, however, there isn't full agreement on the mitigation mechanisms  
525 hypothesized: cation exchange capacity [34,151]; chemical and/or physical adsorption  
526 capacity and surface functional groups [33,34,151]; promotion of direct interspecies  
527 electron transfer (DIET) [44,153]; immobilization of microorganisms [43,44].

528 Therefore, BC may contribute to ammonia mitigation by direct (cation exchange capacity,  
529 adsorption, surface functionality) and/or indirect factors (DIET and immobilization of  
530 microorganisms), depending on the characteristics of both BC and digested substrate,  
531 along with the operating conditions of the AD process (e.g. pH and temperature).  
532 Focusing on direct factors, a better understanding of the interactions between BC and  
533 FAN/TAN is a key step to identify its physico-chemical properties able to maximise the  
534 ammonia removal. The mechanisms for ammonia adsorption on BC from wastewater and  
535 digestate have been studied in literature (Table 5), resulting in promising values of  
536 ammonium adsorption capacity (up to hundreds of mg NH<sub>4</sub>-N g<sup>-1</sup> BC). Yin et al. (2017)  
537 [112] reported that physical sorption could be supported by high SSA and large porous  
538 structure. However, various studies suggested that porosity and SSA may not be the  
539 predominant factors in ammonium adsorption [154,155]. For instance, ion exchange may  
540 occur between acidic functional groups on BC surface and ammonium [112,156,157],  
541 and CEC could have a major role in enhancing the ammonium adsorption capacity of BC  
542 [157]. Zhang et al. (2014) [158] found that BC derived from pyrolysis of corn cob at 400  
543 °C exhibited higher ammonium adsorption capacity than those produced at 600 °C due to  
544 the presence of functional groups with higher acidity. Thus, the definition of the proper  
545 pyrolysis temperature and the other control parameters is crucial for enhancing the  
546 adsorption capacity of BC.

547 In conclusion, various studies reported the potential of BC in alleviating ammonia  
548 inhibition (Tables 4 and 5) through different mechanisms. The direct adsorption of  
549 ammonia on BC may contribute to the mitigation of ammonia inhibition. However,  
550 further studies are required to clarify the effective role of direct mechanisms in complex  
551 AD systems in presence of other phenomena, i.e. the close bond between ammonia and

552 VFAs inhibition. In some cases the direct removal of ammonium may not be the main  
553 contribution to the mitigation of ammonia inhibition by BC [44,82,153]. Instead, other  
554 indirect mechanisms (immobilization and faster acclimation of biomass, DIET) have been  
555 suggested in literature and will be discussed in the next sections.

556

557 Table 4. A summary of selected works focusing on ammonia/ammonium inhibition mitigation by BC in AD processes (FAN: free ammonia  
558 nitrogen; TAN: total ammonia nitrogen).

Biochar				Anaerobic digestion								Reference
Feedstock	Process: temperature [°C]	Dose of biochar	Substrate	Inoculum	Inoculum to substrate ratio (VS basis)	Temperature [°C]	pH	Critical TAN conc. or as specified [mg L <sup>-1</sup> ]	Critical FAN conc. or as specified [mg L <sup>-1</sup> ]	Ammonia removal by biochar	Results and comments	
Fruitwood	Pyrolysis: 800-900°C	10 g L <sup>-1</sup>	Glucose solution (6 g L <sup>-1</sup> )	Granular sludge from AD of paper mill wastewater	1:6	35	7	260 3500 7000	- - -		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ Specified CH<sub>4</sub> prod. rates increased by 18.6%, 10.1% and 23.5% respectively</li> <li>• ↓ Lag phase by 30.4%, 12.7% and 23.8% respectively</li> </ul>	[44]
1:2 (v/v) mix: - paper sludge - wheat husks	Pyrolysis: 500°C	6.67% w/w (2 g BC per 30 g inoculum)	-	Meso. AD (TS = 4.05%) + Ammonium carbonate	Only 30 g of inoculum	42	7.66 7.73 7.93 7.84 8.07	1626 2126 3126 4126 6626	- - - - -	2.4 mg TAN g <sup>-1</sup> BC 2.0 mg TAN g <sup>-1</sup> BC 4.2 mg TAN g <sup>-1</sup> BC 4.5 mg TAN g <sup>-1</sup> BC 6.8 mg TAN g <sup>-1</sup> BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No clear effect on biogas production was observed</li> </ul>	[41]
Macadamia nut shells	Pyrolysis: 350°C	33.3 g L <sup>-1</sup>	Food waste (+ water + NaHCO <sub>3</sub> )	AD from UASB (SS = 34 g)	-	Room temperature		1500	-		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ COD removal from 78% without BC to 90% with BC</li> </ul>	[43]
Corn stover	Gasification	1.82, 2.55, 3.06, 3.64 g BC g <sup>-1</sup> TS sludge	WWTP sludge	Thermo WWTP AD	2:1	55	7.5	1100 (total N)	600 (NH <sub>3</sub> -N)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CH<sub>4</sub> yield, biomethanation rate constant and ↑ max CH<sub>4</sub> prod. rate up to 7.0%, 8.1% and 27.6% respectively</li> <li>• ↑ NH<sub>3</sub>-N concentration by 41.5% after AD without BC, while by 0.2-18.1% with BC</li> </ul>	[151]
Pine pellets White oak pellets	Gasification	2.49, 4.97 g BC g <sup>-1</sup> TS sludge 2.20, 4.40 g BC g <sup>-1</sup> TS sludge	WWTP primary sludge (inoc +subs)	Meso. and thermo. WWTP AD (inoc +subs)	2:1	37, 55	7.2-7.3	750 (total N)	400-450 (NH <sub>3</sub> -N)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ CH<sub>4</sub> yield by 3.9-9.5%</li> <li>• ↑ NH<sub>3</sub>-N concentration by 67.0% after AD without BC, while by -7.2 to 4.7% with BC</li> <li>• ↑ CH<sub>4</sub> yield by 5.7-9.6%</li> <li>• ↑ NH<sub>3</sub>-N concentration by 67.0% after AD without BC, while by -7.2 to 4.7% with BC</li> </ul>	[33]

Corn stover Pine	Gasification: 850°C	0.25, 0.375, 0.5, 1.0 g d <sup>-1</sup>	Primary sludge + WAS (TS = 7.01%)	WWTP AD from TPAD: 1 stage (TS = 6.14%) 2 stage (TS = 3.77%)	2:1	55	7.4 (stage I); 5.3-6.0 (stage II)	-	-	6.2-13.2% 3.6-11.2%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ CH<sub>4</sub> content by 13.7-25.3%</li> <li>• ↑ CH<sub>4</sub> prod. rate by 5.5-36.9%</li> <li>• ↑ CH<sub>4</sub> content by 0.7-9.1%</li> <li>• ↑ CH<sub>4</sub> prod. rate by -2.3-16.6%</li> </ul>	[34]
Wheat bran pellets Coppiced woodlands Orchard pruning	Pyrolysis: 800°C Pyrolysis: 500°C Pyrolysis: 500°C	25 g L <sup>-1</sup>	Food waste fermentate	Anaerobic methanogenic culture (from WAS AD)	-	20	7.5		200-250 (NH <sub>3</sub> -N)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After acclimation: ↑ rate of VFAs degradation and ↓ lag-phase;</li> <li>• No adsorption of ammonia by BC</li> </ul>	[45]
Wheat straw	Pyrolysis: 350, 450, 550°C	5% w/w (chicken manure)	Chicken manure (+ water)	Chicken manure meso. AD	Inoculum: 20% of WV of AD reactor	35	Initial: 6.7-7.6	3450-3540 (average)	472-600 (max)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ Cum. CH<sub>4</sub> yield</li> <li>• ↓ TAN compared to control</li> </ul>	[82]
Fruit wood	Pyrolysis: 350, 450, 550°C						Initial: 6.7-7.0	3440-3650 (average)	421-634 (max)	up to 25% TAN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ Cum. CH<sub>4</sub> yield up to 69%</li> <li>• ↓ TAN compared to control</li> <li>• ↓ FAN up to 58% compared to control</li> </ul>	
Air-dried chicken manure	Pyrolysis: 350, 450, 550°C						Initial: 6.9-7.3	3880-3960 (average)	496-701 (max)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ Cum. CH<sub>4</sub> yield</li> <li>• ↓ TAN compared to control</li> </ul>	

559

560

561 Table 5. Ammonium adsorption capacity of different BCs (NA: not available)

Biochar production		Biochar properties					Adsorption			Reference
Feedstock	Pyrolysis temperature [°C]	BET-SA [m <sup>2</sup> g <sup>-1</sup> ]	pH	CEC [cmol <sub>c</sub> kg <sup>-1</sup> ]	Total pore volume [mL g <sup>-1</sup> ]	Source of NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> -N	Initial NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> -N [mg L <sup>-1</sup> ]	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> adsorption capacity [mg NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> -N g <sup>-1</sup> biochar]		
Oak wood	400-450	NA	9.9	59.4 ± 8.1	NA	Ammonium solution	1000	100.9 ± 3.4		
Oak wood	-	NA	9.7	105.8 ± 12.1	NA	-	-	129.4 ± 34.8		
Greenhouse waste	-	NA	10.6	109.5 ± 21.8	NA	-	-	118.2 ± 26.9		
Municipal waste	-	NA	9.5	65.7 ± 16.2	NA	-	-	137.3 ± 0.6		
Presscake from AD	-	NA	10.3	51.0 ± 5.5	NA	-	-	105.8 ± 11.5	[154]	
Oak wood	600-650	NA	10.3	76.6 ± 0.7	NA	-	-	114.4 ± 3.4		
Oak wood	-	NA	8.6	65.2 ± 20.2	NA	-	-	123.5 ± 28.7		
Greenhouse waste	-	NA	11.0	146.2 ± 32.3	NA	-	-	99.3 ± 28.5		
Municipal waste	-	NA	10.2	67.9 ± 12.5	NA	-	-	128.3 ± 6.7		
Presscake from AD	-	NA	10.1	52.6 ± 11.5	NA	-	-	136.2 ± 18.1		
Hardwood	600	147.0	9.80	NA	0.176	AD slurry	500-580	114.2		
Corncoobs	-	23.0	8.92	NA	0.098	-	-	108.9	[159]	
Mixed sawdust	-	6.80	8.60	NA	0.038	-	-	24.7		

Mixed wood	600	273.623	9.80	NA	0.176	Swine manure AD slurry	1400 mg N L <sup>-1</sup>	44.64 ± 0.602	
Rice husk	/	10.995	7.80	NA	0.038	-	-	39.8 ± 0.54	[155]
1:2 (v/v) mix: - paper sludge - wheat husks	500	NA	NA	NA	NA	During anaerobic digestion	1626 mg TAN kg <sup>-1</sup>	2.4 mg TAN g <sup>-1</sup>	
		-	-	-	-	-	2126 mg TAN kg <sup>-1</sup>	2.0 mg TAN g <sup>-1</sup>	
		-	-	-	-	-	3126 mg TAN kg <sup>-1</sup>	4.2 mg TAN g <sup>-1</sup>	[41]
		-	-	-	-	-	4126 mg TAN kg <sup>-1</sup>	4.5 mg TAN g <sup>-1</sup>	
		-	-	-	-	-	6626 mg TAN kg <sup>-1</sup>	6.8 mg TAN g <sup>-1</sup>	
Fruitwood	800-900	NA	NA	NA	NA	NH <sub>4</sub> Cl solution	NA	2-3 mg N g <sup>-1</sup>	[44]

### 563 4.3. *Effects on microbial populations*

564 Many authors reported the positive effects of BC on microbial populations in AD (Table  
565 6). In semi-continuous and continuous AD experiments, BC addition improved methane  
566 production [34] keeping it stable even with rising OLRs [29,49] and resulted in higher  
567 COD removal rates [43,50,51].

568 Although there is a good agreement among the studies in terms of enhancement of AD  
569 process performances (11-30 % reduction of lag phases and 11-50 % increments of  
570 methane production rates) (Table 6), there is not a common hypothesis to explain BC  
571 influence on microbial populations, and different possible mechanisms are proposed as  
572 follows.

#### 573 4.3.1. *Microbial attachment and acclimation*

574 Immobilization and acclimation of balanced microbial consortia on various support media  
575 are commonly adopted for counteracting various drawbacks of AD processes [160],  
576 thanks to the intensification of syntrophic conversion relationships, along with a major  
577 resistance to inhibition effects [161]. Wang et al. (2018) [50] found that BC acted as an  
578 inert core for microbial aggregation, resulting in a higher microbial growth rate and  
579 accelerating sludge granulation. Cooney et al. 2016 [53] investigated the possibility of  
580 accelerating biofilm formation by adding BC during the start-up of a packed bed  
581 anaerobic digester at pilot scale. In a relatively short time, the AD system reached stable  
582 and good performances, suggesting the rapid development of biofilms rich in active  
583 methanogens.

584 High SSA, proper porosity structure and particle size, superficial hydrophobicity seemed  
585 to be important properties favouring microbial immobilization [12,52]. Further,  
586 conductive materials may act as ideal support media due to their surface hydrophobicity

587 and porous structure [54,55]. In particular, macropores can help the attachments of  
588 bacterial cells [19,162,163]. Lü et al. (2016) [44] explored the influence of different  
589 particle sizes of BC (2-5 mm, 0.5-1 mm, 75-150  $\mu\text{m}$ ) on the microbial distribution during  
590 the AD of glucose under ammonium stress. They stated that bacteria could access more  
591 easily fine particles than coarse particles. As a consequence, the attachment and  
592 colonization of microbial populations on BC can limit the risks of wash-out, accelerate  
593 the acclimation of microbes during substrate-induced inhibition, reduce the distance  
594 between syntrophic bacteria and methanogens, facilitate interspecies electron transfer and  
595 exchanges of VFAs or other metabolites [16,36,137]. Li et al. (2018) [46] found that  
596 methanogens survived under acidic stress in presence of BC during co-digestion of FW  
597 and WAS. Further, the immobilization of microbes could significantly attenuate ammonia  
598 inhibition [43,44]. The colonization of porous materials by microbes can alter the  
599 dominant species, making them more resistant and more rapidly acclimatized to substrate-  
600 induced inhibition [29,36,164]. Magnetic BC favoured the enrichment of acido/acetogens  
601 and methanogens absorbed on its surface shortening the microbial contact distance, thus  
602 VFAs produced by acido/acetogen bacteria could be more quickly transported to  
603 methanogens than in control digesters during AD of OFMSW in batch tests [16,139]. The  
604 distance of less than 1  $\mu\text{m}$  has been reported to be essential for the oxidation of VFAs and  
605 hydrogen production [19,165].

#### 606 4.3.2. *Selective colonization of functional microbes*

607 The effect of BC addition on microbial communities was investigated with the aim of  
608 identifying the most abundant bacterial and archaeal populations and, indirectly, the main  
609 interspecies interactions (Table 6). In detail, most studies focused on: biofilm formation  
610 [26,48,53]; shifts of microbial populations [28,34,46,47]; selective enrichment of

611 microbial -DIET partners [38,44,49,50]; promotion of DIET [38,44–46,49,51,139]. The  
612 relevant anaerobic bacteria and archaea enriched in BC amended digesters are reported  
613 in Table 7, together with BC properties, substrate and inoculum used in AD tests. Many  
614 bacterial species were found in reactors supplemented with BCs, none of them identified  
615 as more recurrent. Among archaeae, most studies identified *methanosaeta*,  
616 *methanosarcina*, *methanobacterium*, and *methanolinea* species in BC amended reactors.  
617 Different studies [44,48,51] investigated the spatial distribution of bacteria and archaea  
618 by dividing sludge samples into different fractions, from suspended to attached to BC. Lü  
619 et al. (2016) [44] postulated an explanation for the spatial distribution of methanogens  
620 into BC pores by their cell morphology and dimension. The short fibrous form of  
621 Methanosaeta (0.8-7 µm in size) could explain its attachment into internal and external  
622 pores, while the long fibrous form of Methanobacterium (1.2-120 µm in length) could  
623 limit its penetration into BC pores [44,166].

#### 624 4.3.3. Promotion of syntrophic metabolisms

625 Many studies (Table 7) suggested that BC addition may improve electron transfer  
626 mechanisms between anaerobic bacteria and archaea closely attached to BC surface. The  
627 overall AD efficiency depends on effective syntrophic interactions between bacteria and  
628 methanogens exchanging electrons to satisfy their energy requirements [56], happening  
629 through various routes:

- 630 - Indirect interspecies electron transfer (IIET) via soluble (i.e. hydrogen, formate,  
631 acetate) [167,168] and insoluble (humic substances) [169,170] compounds;
- 632 - Direct interspecies electron transfer (DIET) via electrical conductive pili, membrane-  
633 bound electron transport proteins, and conductive materials (i.e. magnetite, biochar,  
634 granular activated carbon, carbon cloth) [171–173].

635 In IJET hydrogen and formate operate as electron shuttles between syntrophic-producing  
636 bacteria and consuming-methanogens [56]. Diffusion regulates the transfer of a  
637 metabolite between microorganisms, as defined by Fick's Law [174]: the shorter the  
638 distance, the higher the flux of metabolites between microbes. Thereby, when cells  
639 aggregate the rate of interspecies hydrogen transfer is enhanced by the moment anaerobic  
640 bacteria and methanogenic archaea form compact structures acting as an organ [174,175].  
641 However, the diffusion of soluble metabolites is considered a relatively slow mechanism  
642 of energy and information transfer [173] and hydrogen IET is regarded as a bottleneck in  
643 methane production [171]. On the contrary, DIET consists in the formation of an electric  
644 current between electron-donating and electron-acceptor microorganisms without the  
645 mediation of electron shuttles [56]. DIET could be faster and more specific compared to  
646 IJET [173,176]. Park et al. (2018) [171] reported that direct exchange of electrons via  
647 conductive pili was observed in co-cultures between *geobacter metallireducens* and  
648 *geobacter sulfurreducens* [176], *methanosaeta harundinacea* [177], or *methanosarcina*  
649 *barkeri* [178]. Conductive materials such as magnetite [179], GAC [180], and BC [57]  
650 were shown to effectively mediate DIET between syntrophic partners.

651 Based on changes in the microbial community composition, many studies justified the  
652 enhancement of AD activity by means of the improvement of hydrogen and formate  
653 interspecies transfer mechanisms or, more frequently, by DIET via conductive biochar  
654 (Table 7). These findings are usually based on indirect observations, i.e. the enrichment  
655 of bacterial and archaeal species able to participate to DIET function as potential partners.  
656 Martinez et al. (2018) [47] found an enrichment of homoacetogenic bacteria, as  
657 *Clostridium*, *Eubacterium* and *Syntrophomonas*, and H<sub>2</sub> using methanogens through the  
658 analysis of microbial communities in digesting WAS and orange peels with BC,

659 suggesting the formation of co-cultures enhancing methane production. Zhao et al. (2016)  
660 [51] observed the selective enrichment on BC of *Geobacter* and *Methanosaeta* during  
661 AD of synthetic wastewater with butyrate and propionate in UASB reactors. They  
662 suggested that butyrate and propionate could be degraded via DIET in the presence of a  
663 conductive material, and they found abundance of *Syntrophomonas* and *Smithella*,  
664 concluding that the metabolism via interspecies H<sub>2</sub> transfer for butyrate and propionate  
665 degradation was probably present. Wang et al. (2018) [50] showed that the microbial  
666 community analysis in a BC amended reactor during AD of synthetic wastewater resulted  
667 in the selective enrichment of potential DIET-partners, as *Geobacter* and *Bacteroidetes*,  
668 as well as archaea *Methanosaeta* and *Methanosarcina*. They suggested that BC could  
669 enhance DIET among electrogenic microbes and archaea, improving the electron transfer  
670 characteristics of granular sludge, as well as COD removal and methane yield. Wang et  
671 al. (2018) [38] found that the addition of different BC doses increased methane production  
672 rate and shortened the lag phase during mesophilic AD of dewatered WAS and FW.  
673 According to the authors, BC counteracted the pH decrease due to VFAs accumulation  
674 through its buffering capacity, and it seemed to promote DIET.

675 Aside from physical properties as SSA and porosity, favouring microbial colonization,  
676 other chemical and conductive characteristics of BC may be crucial in the promotion of  
677 electrons transfer. The role of electrical conductivity (EC) of BC in AD has been  
678 investigated in literature[59]. EC of digestate has been reported to increase in presence of  
679 BC [50,151]. However, the EC of digestate seemed unrelated to the conductivity of BC,  
680 which varies depending on the metabolism and composition of microbial species [56].  
681 The capability of BC in promoting DIET appeared to be comparable to that of GAC, even  
682 if the EC of BC was roughly 1000 times lower [57,171]. Barua and Dhar (2017) [181]

683 reported that multi-species aggregates from anaerobic digesters exhibited conductivity  
684 ranging 0.2-36.7  $\mu\text{S cm}^{-1}$ , suggesting its relation with DIET via conductive pili . Martins  
685 et al. (2018) [56] stated that conductive materials could have a similar role of humic  
686 substances in DIET, acting as electron shuttles by receiving and donating electrons. Wang  
687 et al. (2019) [49] suggested that BC from sawdust may act as a temporary electron  
688 acceptor for VFAs oxidation during thermophilic AD. They found a significantly higher  
689 and more stable methane yield at higher OLR values during anaerobic co-digestion in  
690 semi-continuous mode with the addition of BC from sawdust, while they did not show  
691 any enhancement of AD with the addition of BC from sewage sludge. The main effects  
692 of sawdust BC seemed to be the enhancements of microbial activities and syntrophic  
693 oxidation of VFAs. The EC of both BCs was similar, suggesting it was not a determinant  
694 factor in the promotion of syntrophic oxidation of VFAs. Instead, the authors speculated  
695 that the presence of redox-active phenazine structures in the BC from sawdust could  
696 promote VFAs degradation via DIET. Thereby, for better investigating whether BC from  
697 sawdust could substitute hydrogen as electron acceptor in syntrophic oxidation of VFAs,  
698 they conducted a series of batch experiments with butyrate or propionate as substrates in  
699 which methanogenesis was inhibited. The control reactors did not show degradation of  
700 butyrate and propionate, while the addition of BC stimulated their oxidation as well as  
701 the production of acetate, supporting the hypothesis of the electron-accepting capacity of  
702 BC in the syntrophic process.

703 The adoption of a further control in AD tests amended with a non-conductive material  
704 can be crucial to investigate whether the stimulatory effects of BC on methane production  
705 can be more closely linked to its physical properties (i.e. SSA and porosity) rather than  
706 its electrical properties [56]. This was evident in the study of Cruz Viggi et al. (2017)

707 [45], where they introduced two controls without BC and with non-conductive silica sand  
708 for AD of FW. They found that VFAs degradation and methane production were faster  
709 in the case of BC amended reactors than both the control reactors, suggesting the  
710 predominant influence of the electrical properties of BCs.

711 Table 6. A summary of selected works focusing on positive effects of BC on microbial populations in AD processes

Biochar	Anaerobic digestion								References
Feedstock	Production of biochar	Dose	Substrate	Inoculum	Temperature [°C]	Experimental mode	Results	Possible mechanisms	
Sawdust	Pyrolysis: • 500°C • 1 h • 20°C min <sup>-1</sup>	10 g L <sup>-1</sup>	Food waste (TS = 94.2 g L <sup>-1</sup> )	WAS (TS = 89.1 g L <sup>-1</sup> )	55°C	Batch V = 120 mL S/I (VS) = 0.25 - 3	By ↑ OLR: • ↓ lag time • ↑ CH <sub>4</sub> prod. rate	• ↑ buffer capacity • Microbial attachment and acclimation on BC • Promotion of DIET • Selective succession of microbes	[46]
Pine sawdust	Pyrolysis: • 650°C • 20 min	8.3 - 33.3 g L <sup>-1</sup>	Food waste (bread) (TS = 61.2%)	WWTP-sludge (heated at 95°C)	35°C	Batch V = 100 mL TPAD	1 <sup>st</sup> phase: • ↓ lag phase • Faster VFAs generation • ↑ H <sub>2</sub> prod. rate • ↑ Cum. H <sub>2</sub> prod.  2 <sup>nd</sup> phase: • ↓ lag phase (41-45%) • Faster VFA degradation • ↑ CH <sub>4</sub> prod. rate	1 <sup>st</sup> phase: • Promotion biofilm formation • Providing temporary nutrients • Buffering pH by BC  2 <sup>nd</sup> phase: • Promotion methanogenic biofilm formation • No buffering pH by BC	[26]
Macadamia nut shells	Pyrolysis: • 350°C • 2 h	33.3 g L <sup>-1</sup>	Food waste + water + (↑ N-NH <sub>4</sub> conc.)	AD from	Room temperature	CIC reactor V = 4.6 L HRT=16 h	• ↑ COD removal by 15%	• ↓ NH <sub>3</sub> inhibition by BC • ↑ Alkalinity by BC • ↓ VFAs accumulation	[43]

Biochar		Anaerobic digestion							References
Feedstock	Production	Dose of biochar	Substrate	Inoculum	Temperature	Experimental mode	Results	Possible mechanisms	
	• 10°C min <sup>-1</sup>							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ Selective enrichment of functional microbes</li> <li>• Microbial attachment and acclimation on BC</li> </ul>	
				(SS = 34 g L <sup>-1</sup> )					
Sawdust	Pyrolysis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 500°C</li> <li>• 1.5 h</li> <li>• 10°C min<sup>-1</sup></li> </ul>	2 - 15 g L <sup>-1</sup>	Dewatered WAS + Food waste (TS = 8.8%) + water	Meso. AD from brewery factory (TS = 6.8%)	35°C	Batch Serum bottles WV = 90 mL S/I = 0.75 - 3 (VS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↓ lag phase by 27.5–64.4%</li> <li>• ↑ Max CH<sub>4</sub> prod. rate by 22.4%–40.3%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buffer capacity by BC (alleviate ↓ pH due to ↑ VFAs)</li> <li>• ↑ DIET by BC (temporary electron acceptor, due to the richness of surface functional groups)</li> <li>• Selective enrichment of microbial DIET-partners by BC</li> </ul>	[38]
Sawdust	Pyrolysis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 500°C</li> </ul>	15 g L <sup>-1</sup>	Food waste + Sewage sludge (TS = 9.2%) FW/Sludge = 4:1 (TS)	Brewery Meso. AD (TS = 5.2%)	55°C	Semi-continuous Serum bottles WV = 150 mL ↓ HRT, ↑ OLR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ CH<sub>4</sub> yield by 16.0%–55.2%</li> <li>• Stable CH<sub>4</sub> prod. at ↑ OLRs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ VFAs syntrophic oxidation by BC</li> <li>• High SA of BC → microbial attachment (?), closer association of syntrophic partners</li> <li>• Electroactive functional groups of BC → stimulation of DIET (?)</li> </ul>	[49]
Corn stover	Gasification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 850°C</li> </ul>	0.25 - 1.0 g d <sup>-1</sup> (2 <sup>nd</sup> phase)	Primary sludge + WAS (TS = 7.01%)	WWTP AD	55°C	Semi-continuous V = 500 mL TPAD:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ % CH<sub>4</sub> by 13.7-25.3%</li> <li>• ↑ CH<sub>4</sub> prod. rate by 5.5-36.9%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adsorption and precipitation of CO<sub>2</sub> by BC</li> <li>• ↓ TAN</li> <li>• ↑ Alkalinity</li> <li>• ↑ Macro-/micro-nutrients in digestate</li> <li>• Shift in bacterial community</li> </ul>	[34,182]

Biochar		Anaerobic digestion							References	
Feedstock	Production	Dose of biochar	Substrate	Inoculum	Temperature [°C]	Experimental mode	Results	Possible mechanisms		
				TPAD:		1) HRT = 5, 15 d		• Inhibition at high BC doses		
				1 ph. (TS = 6.14%)		2) HRT = 13 - 30 d				
				2 ph. (TS = 3.77%)						
Pine	-	-	-	-	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ % CH<sub>4</sub> by 0.7-9.1%</li> <li>• ↑ CH<sub>4</sub> prod. rate by 2.3-16.6%</li> </ul>			
Corn stover	Gasification	1.82 g BC	-3.64 g <sup>-1</sup> TS sludge	WWTP	Thermo. WWTP AD	55°C	Batch V = 600 mL 26 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ % CH<sub>4</sub> (88.5-96.7%)</li> <li>• ↑ CH<sub>4</sub> yield</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ buffer capacity</li> <li>• ↑ electrical conductivity in digester (+37%)</li> <li>→ ? ↑ extracellular electron transfer</li> <li>• ↓ NH<sub>3</sub> inhibition</li> <li>• CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration by BC</li> <li>• ↑ macro-/micro-nutrients in digestate</li> </ul>	[151]
Rice husks	Gasification	1%, w/w	3% Cattle manure + water (TS = 5%)	-	-	35°C	Batch V = 1400 mL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ Biogas prod. by 31% by 1% BC</li> <li>• ↓ % CH<sub>4</sub> by 7% by 1% BC</li> <li>• No benefits by 3% BC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ? Microbial biofilm formation on BC</li> </ul>	[30]

Biochar		Anaerobic digestion								References
Feedstock	Production	Dose	of	Substrate	Inoculum	Temperature	Experimental mode	Results	Possible mechanisms	
			biochar			[°C]				
Rice husks	Gasification: 900-1000°C	1%, 3% w/w	Cattle manure + water (Mix: TS = 5%)	-	Inoculum from lagoon, fed with dried manure (TS = 115.85 g L <sup>-1</sup> )	25-30°C	Semi-continuous WV = 12 L HRT = 20 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ Biogas prod. by 4-5% by BC</li> <li>• ↓ % CH<sub>4</sub></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ? Not enough time for biofilm formation</li> </ul>	[31]
Dry dairy manure	Pyrolysis: 350°C, 3 h, 10°C min <sup>-1</sup>	0, 1, 10 g L <sup>-1</sup>	Dry dairy manure	-	Inoculum from lagoon, fed with dried manure (TS = 115.85 g L <sup>-1</sup> )	20°C	Batch: Serum bottles V = 280 mL S/I = 1 (VS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ CH<sub>4</sub> yield up to 26.5%</li> <li>• ↓ lag phase</li> <li>• ↓ total VFAs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No biofilm formation on BC (?)</li> <li>• No effects on DIET by BC (?)</li> <li>• ↑ Alkalinity and ↑ pH (buffer capacity)</li> </ul>	[27]
-	-	-	-	-	-	35°C	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ CH<sub>4</sub> yield up to 24.9%</li> <li>• ↓ lag phase</li> <li>• ↓ total VFAs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ Alkalinity and ↑ pH (buffer capacity)</li> </ul>	
-	-	-	-	-	-	55°C	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ CH<sub>4</sub> yield up to 24.7%</li> <li>• ↓ lag phase</li> <li>• ↓ total VFAs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ Alkalinity and ↑ pH (buffer capacity)</li> </ul>	
Vineyard prunings	Pyrolysis: 550°C	10, 30 g L <sup>-1</sup>	Co-digestion:	-	WWTP AD	37°C	Batch: V = 250 mL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↓ lag phase</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotion of syntrophic metabolism by BC</li> <li>• Adsorption of inhibitors</li> </ul>	[47,183]

Biochar		Anaerobic digestion							References
Feedstock	Production	Dose of biochar	Substrate	Inoculum	Temperature [°C]	Experimental mode	Results	Possible mechanisms	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Orange peels (TS = 311g kg<sup>-1</sup>)</li> <li>Sewage sludge (TS = 28.7g kg<sup>-1</sup>)</li> </ul>	(TS = 35.5 g kg <sup>-1</sup> ) <sup>1)</sup>		Semi-continuous: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>V = 3 L</li> <li>HRT = 10-30 days</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>↑ CH<sub>4</sub> prod.</li> <li>↑ CH<sub>4</sub> prod.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adhesion and growth of microorganisms by BC SA</li> </ul>	
Coconut shell	Pyrolysis: • 450°C	1:1 (TS)	Citrus peel (TS = 16.6%)	WWTP AD (TS = 11.0 %)	35°C	Batch V=500 mL S/I = 0.31 - 0.33 (VS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>↓ lag phase</li> <li>↑ Cum. CH<sub>4</sub> prod.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limonene adsorption by BC</li> </ul>	[40]
Rice husk	-	1:1 (TS)	-	-	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>↓ lag phase</li> <li>↑ Cum. CH<sub>4</sub> prod.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limonene adsorption by BC</li> <li>Adhesion and growth of microbes on BC</li> </ul>	
Wood	-	1:1; 1:2; 1:3; (TS)	1:2; 2:1	-	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>↓ lag phase</li> <li>↑ Cum. CH<sub>4</sub> prod.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limonene adsorption by BC</li> <li>Adhesion and growth of microbes on BC</li> </ul>	

Biochar		Anaerobic digestion								References
Feedstock	Production	Dose of biochar	Substrate	Inoculum	Temperature [°C]	Experimental mode	Results	Possible mechanisms		
Rice straw	In solution: FeCl <sub>3</sub> • 2h (3.2 g FeCl <sub>3</sub> :100 g rice-straw)	0.5% w/w	OFMSW + water (TS = 1.64%)	Meso. AD + water (TS = 2.19%)	35°C	Batch Serum bottles V = 500 mL, S/I = 1 (VS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↓ lag phase</li> <li>• ↑ CH<sub>4</sub> prod. by 11.69%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No effects on NH<sub>3</sub> by BC</li> <li>• No effects on pH by BC</li> <li>• ↑ syntrophic associations of bacteria on BC</li> <li>• (?) DIET by high conductivity of BC</li> </ul>	[139]	
Rice straw	Carbonization: • 500°C • 2h	-	-	-	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↓ lag phase</li> <li>• ↓ CH<sub>4</sub> prod.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No effects on NH<sub>3</sub> by BC</li> <li>• No effects on pH by BC</li> </ul>		
Cow manure	Pyrolysis: • 500°C • 4 h • 100°C h <sup>-1</sup>	2 – 14 g L <sup>-1</sup>	Dry beer lees (TS = 62.5%)	Meso. WWTP AD (TS = 36.7%)	35°C	Batch WV = 150 mL TS = 25% S/I = 3 (TS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↓ lag phase</li> <li>• ↑ Max cum. CH<sub>4</sub> prod. up to 82.9%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotion of DIET by BC conductive properties (?)</li> <li>• Microbial colonisation and biofilm formation on BC (?)</li> <li>• ↑ Alkalinity and ↑ pH (buffer capacity)</li> <li>• Selective enrichment of methanogens by BC</li> </ul>	[28]	
-	-	-	-	Thermo. WWTP AD (TS = 38.5%)	55°C	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↓ lag phase</li> <li>• ↑ Max cum. CH<sub>4</sub> prod. up to 47.2%</li> </ul>	-		
Rice straw	Pyrolysis: • 500°C	4 g L <sup>-1</sup>	Synthetic wastewater	WWTP sludge	35°C	UASB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UASB: ↑ COD removal rate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No effects on pH by BC</li> <li>• BC inert core for microbial aggregation</li> </ul>	[50]	

Biochar		Anaerobic digestion							References
Feedstock	Production	Dose of biochar	Substrate	Inoculum	Temperature [°C]	Experimental mode	Results	Possible mechanisms	
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuous mode</li> <li>• V = 5500 mL</li> <li>• HRT = 12 h, 12-6 h</li> <li>Batch: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↓ lag phase by 28.6%</li> <li>• ↑ biogas yield</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Serum bottles</li> <li>• V = 550 mL</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ VFAs degradation</li> <li>• ↑ gran. sludge conductivity and quality</li> <li>• Selective enrichment of microbial DIET-partners by BC</li> </ul>	
-	Biochar	-	Grease trap waste wastewater (TSS = 1.04 g L <sup>-1</sup> )	-	37°C	Biochar packed bed anaerobic digester +1500 L+ 1500 L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COD removal:68%</li> <li>• Total VFAs: from 4.7 (feed) to 1.46 g L<sup>-1</sup> (effluent)</li> <li>• %CH<sub>4</sub> &gt; 60%</li> <li>• Start-up: 59 days</li> <li>• ↓ HRT (3.1 – 1.8 days)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ Methanogenic biofilm communities on BC</li> <li>• BS as packing material for growth and retention of biofilm</li> </ul>	[53]

Biochar		Anaerobic digestion								References
Feedstock	Production	Dose of biochar	Substrate	Inoculum	Temperature [°C]	Experimental mode	Results	Possible mechanisms		
Wheat bran pellets	Pyrolysis: • 800°C • 3h	25 g L <sup>-1</sup>	Food waste fermentate	Methanogenic culture (from WAS digestate)	20°C	Batch V = 120 mL	After acclimation: • ↑ rate of VFAs degradation • ↓ lag-phase	• No effects on pH via BC • No effects on NH <sub>3</sub> via BC • Promotion of IET by BC	[45]	
Coppiced woodlands	Pyrolysis: • 500°C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Orchard pruning	Pyrolysis: • 500°C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Fruitwood	Pyrolysis: • 800-900°C	10 g L <sup>-1</sup>	Glucose (6 g L <sup>-1</sup> )	AD gran.	35°C	Batch Serum bottles	• ↓ lag phase by 5.9-23.9% • ↑max CH <sub>4</sub> prod. rate by 23.5-47.1% • Faster VFAs degradation	• NOT NH <sub>4</sub> adsorption • NOT ↑ buffer capacity • DIET promotion via BC • Affinity of methanogens with BC	[44]	

Biochar		Anaerobic digestion								References
Feedstock	Production	Dose of biochar	Substrate	Inoculum	Temperature [°C]	Experimental mode	Results	Possible mechanisms		
Ammonium: 0.26, 3.5, 7 g-N L <sup>-1</sup>										
Fruit wood	Pyrolysis: • 800°C	10 g L <sup>-1</sup>	Nutrient solution + glucose (2 - 8 g L <sup>-1</sup> )	Meso. pulp sewage digestate (1 g VS L <sup>-1</sup> )	35°C	Batch Serum bottles V = 500 mL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↓ lag phase by 11.4-30.3%</li> <li>• ↑ Max CH<sub>4</sub> prod. rate by 5.2-86.6%</li> <li>• ↑ VFAs production and degradation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selective colonization of functional microbes by BC</li> <li>• Not ↑ buffer capacity</li> <li>• ? Biofilm growth on BC</li> <li>• ? Promotion of DIET or Hydrogen IET by BC</li> </ul>	[48]	
Pine wood	Pyrolysis: • 600°C • 2h	5 g L <sup>-1</sup>	Synthetic wastewater with butyrate	WAS digestate (TSS = 13.1 g)	37°C	UASB WV = 1000 mL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ CH<sub>4</sub> prod. rate by 25%</li> <li>• ↑ COD removal</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ Butyrate degradation via DIET in UASB via BC</li> <li>• Selective enrichment of microbial DIET-partners by BC</li> </ul>	[51,57]	
			Synthetic wastewater with propionate				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ CH<sub>4</sub> prod. rate by 16%</li> <li>• ↑ COD removal</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ Propionate degradation via DIET in UASB via BC</li> <li>• Selective enrichment of microbial DIET-partners by BC</li> </ul>		

Biochar		Anaerobic digestion							References	
Feedstock	Production	Dose	of	Substrate	Inoculum	Temperature	Experimental mode	Results	Possible mechanisms	
k		biochar				[°C]				
-	Biochar	2.5 g L <sup>-1</sup>	Synthetic wastewater with ethanol	WAS digestate (TSS = 13.1 g)	37°C	UASB	WV = 1000 mL ↓ HRT (24 - 8 h)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ COD removal: ≥ 93% (control: 75-83%)</li> <li>• ↑ CH<sub>4</sub> prod. rate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (?) Promotion syntrophic metabolism via DIET with BC in UASB reactors</li> </ul>	[29]

CIC: controlling internal circulation; COD: chemical oxygen demand; DIET: direct interspecies electron transfer; FW: food waste; HRT: hydraulic retention time; IET: interspecies electron transfer; OLR: organic loading rate; OFMSW: organic fraction of municipal solid waste; SA: surface area; S/I: substrate to inoculum ratio; SMP: specific methane potential; SS: suspended solids; TPAD: two phased anaerobic digestion; TSS: total suspended solids; UASB: up-flow anaerobic sludge blanket; VFA: volatile fatty acid; WAS: waste activated sludge; WWTP: wastewater treatment plant; WV: working volume; V: volume.

712

713

714 Table 7. A summary of studies reporting the selective enrichment of bacteria and archaea by BC addition during AD processes

Biochar production		Biochar properties			Anaerobic digestion				Reference	
Feedstock	Pyrolysis temperature [°C]	BET-SSA [m <sup>2</sup> g <sup>-1</sup> ]	Electrical conductivity [S m <sup>-1</sup> ]	Total pore volume [cm <sup>3</sup> g <sup>-1</sup> ]	Temperature [°C]	Substrate	Identification technique	Enriched Bacteria	Enriched Archaea	
Wheat bran pellets	800	55 ± 1	49.9	0.0445	20	Food waste fermentate	FISH- CLSM		More Methanosarcina-like Archaea rather than Methanosaeta like Archaea	[45]
Coppiced woodlands	500	61 ± 1	1.6	0.0483						
Orchard pruning	500	13.7 ± 0.5	0.5	0.0165						
Macadamia nut shells	350	12.7	-	-	Room temperature	Food waste + water	16S rRNA sequencing	Bacteroidales Anaerolineales Syntrophobacterales	Methanoregulaceae Methanotrichaceae Methanobacteriaceae	[43]
Fruitwoods	800-900	-	-	-	35	Glucose	16S rRNA sequencing	Enterobacteriaceae	Methanobacterium Methanosaeta Methanosarcina	[44]
Fruit wood	800	-	-	-	35	Glucose	16S rRNA sequencing	Syntrophomonas Clostridium Clostridiaceae	Methanobacterium Methanosaeta Methanosarcina	[48]
Rice straw + FeCl <sub>3</sub> (3.2 g FeCl <sub>3</sub> :100 g rice-straw)	500	51.14	-	0.0328	35	OFMSW + water	16S rRNA sequencing	Bacteroides Clostridiaceae Porphyromonadaceae Moraxellaceae	Methanosarcina Methanobacterium OTU in Methanomicrobiales Methanosaeta	[139]
Rice straw	500	111.5	-	-	35	Synthetic wastewater	16S rRNA sequencing	Bacteroidetes unclassified (23.65%) Bacteroidales unclassified (9.19%)	Methanosaeta (77.18%) Methanosarcina (11.65%)	[50]

									Treponema (6.43%)			
									Smithella (5.56%)			
									Brooklawnia (5.45%)			
									Geobacter (5.42%)			
Sawdust	500	248.6	-	-	35	Dewatered WAS + food waste + water	16S rRNA sequencing	Anaerolineaceae Porphyromonadaceae	Methanoaeta Methanobacterium Methanolinea	[38]		
Cow manure	500	112.6	-	0.0156	35	Dry beer lees	16S rRNA sequencing	Chloroflexi Bacteroides Proteobacteria	Methanospirillum Methanosarcina Methanolinea	[28]		
Vineyard prunings	550	240 ± 4.8	-	-	37	Orange peels	16S rRNA sequencing	Bellilinea Trepomena Clostridium Petrimonas Proteiniphilum Bacteroides	Methanoaeta Thermogymnomonas Methanolinea Methanofollis	[47]		
Vineyard prunings	550	240 ± 4.8	.	-	37	Sewage sludge	16S rRNA sequencing	Clostridium Longilinea Curvibacter Eubacterium Syntrophomonas	Methanoaeta Methanolinea Thermogymnomonas Methanobacterium			
Pinewood	600	209	.33 μS cm <sup>-1</sup>	.	-	37	Synthetic wastewater with butyrate	16S rRNA sequencing	Attached sludge: Geobacter Thermanaerovibrio Syntrophomonas	Attached sludge: Methanoaeta Methanosarcina Methanospirillum	[51]	
Pinewood	600	209	4.33 μS cm <sup>-1</sup>	.	-	37	Synthetic wastewater with propionate	16S rRNA sequencing	Attached sludge: Geobacter Smithella	Attached sludge: Methanoaeta Methanobacterium		

								Syntrophus	Methanosphaerula	
Biochar	-	-	-	-	37	Grease trap waste wastewater	16S rRNA sequencing	Attached to BC: Aminobacterium Syntrophomonas Sporanaerobacter Escherichia	Attached to BC: Methanobacterium Methanosarcina Methanobrevibacter	[53]
Sawdust	500	248 ± 34	-	-	55	Food waste	16S rRNA sequencing	Coprothermobacter (36.3%) Fervidobacterium (20.0%) Syntrophothermus Treponema	Methanosaeta (43.9%) Methanosarcina (15.8%)	[46]
Corn stover	850	315.2	-	0.09	55	Primary sludge + WAS	16S rRNA sequencing	Firmicutes (Clostridia) Bacteroidetes Proteobacteria	Methanothermobacter (>90%) Methanosarcina	[34]
Pine		353.1	-	0.23						
Sawdust	500	248.6 ± 9.4	0.11 μS cm <sup>-1</sup>	-	55	Food waste + Sewage sludge	16S rRNA sequencing	Deffluviitoga Tepidimicrobium	Methanothermobacter Methanosarcina	[49]

NA: not available; CLSM: confocal laser scanning microscopy; FISH: Fluorescence in situ hybridization; OFMSW: organic fraction of municipal solid waste; SSA: surface area; WAS: waste activated sludge.

715

716

717 4.4. Effect of biochar on digestate quality

718 Anaerobic digestate has been considered as soil improver because it is rich in nutrients  
 719 [184–186]. However, challenges related to digestate management have recently grown in  
 720 association with EU regulations on ammonia, volatile organic acids, phenolic  
 721 compounds, heavy metals, PAHs and PCBs [4,187]. So far, most technologies available  
 722 to exploit digestate as soil improver are based on mechanical/physical (e.g. mechanical  
 723 dewatering, semipermeable membranes and evaporation) or chemical processes (e.g.  
 724 ammonia stripping and nutrients adjustment) (Table 8).

725

726 Table 8. Advantages and disadvantages of conventional technologies for digestate  
 727 processing [188–191].

Methods	Advantages	Disadvantages
Solid-liquid separation	Rich in phosphorus and suitable for fertilizer application	Liquid fraction has been considered as a surface and ground water pollutions
Belt and drum dryers	treatment and upgrading of digestate to a solid or concentrated product	Rapid volatilization of ammonium causes severe ammonia emission
High-Tech technologies (e.g. ammonia stripping, membrane process and vacuum evaporation exist)	Production of several streams with different physical and chemical properties.	Expensive
Mixing solid digestate with desired nutrient	Increasing value per ton	-

728

729 Dehydrated digestate could be used in non-agricultural markets as a heating fuel,  
 730 however, this use implies nutrient and metal losses, which in turn have negative impacts

731 on the environment and crops. Consequently, three approaches have been conventionally  
 732 applied to reduce diffuse pollution resulting from digestate application to land [19,188]:  
 733 - Nutrient recovery from digestate;  
 734 - Carbon to Nitrogen ratio adjustment;  
 735 - Increasing of nutrient retention capacity using an additive.

736 One of the key aspects that should be considered when supplying additives to AD process  
 737 is their effects on the quality of digestate for subsequent uses, especially as soil improver.  
 738 Despite literature has not explored enough the fate and properties of digestate with BC to  
 739 land applications, some potential benefits of BC amendment can be identified as follows.  
 740 BC remaining in digestate after AD acts as a nutrient retention improver and catalyst,  
 741 mitigates leaching of heavy metals and pollutants via physical and chemical absorption  
 742 of organics, phosphate, ammonium, nitrate, nitrite, metals and CO<sub>2</sub> [19,192]. The  
 743 improvements on digestate quality can be related to BC features as SSA, surface  
 744 functional groups, ash content and presence of metals (Table 9).

745

746 Table 9. Biochar properties able to improve digestate quality

Factors	Function	Literature	Reference
Textural properties (surface area, pore size)	Higher content of functional group (e.g. Si-O-Si, O-H and C=O)	HCl, NH <sub>3</sub> ·H <sub>2</sub> O and KMnO <sub>4</sub> modification were performed to obtain functional biochar from Swine manure digestate.	[193]
	Increase of the pH and cation exchange capacity	H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> and KOH modification were performed to obtain functional biochar from domestic sewage sludge digestate	[104]
Ash content	Alkali and alkaline earth metals increase the alkalinity	Pinewood and white oak biochars made digestate a great alternative to agricultural lime fertilizer.	[33]

Metals on the surface	The cation form of the metal can bind with soluble phosphorus	Ex: $3\text{Fe}(\text{OH})_2 + 2\text{H}_3\text{PO}_4^{3-} \rightarrow \text{Fe}_3(\text{PO}_4)_2 + 6\text{H}_2\text{O}$	[151]
Functional group	Negatively charged functional groups forms complexes with heavy metals	Manganese oxide-modified biochar composite derived from corn straws improved heavy metal stabilization in the digestate	[194]

747

748 BC supplement in digesters may be beneficial to the fertilizer value of digestates. Shen et  
749 al. [34,151] have found that BC addition can cause a substantial increase of the macro-  
750 and micro-nutrients as N, P, K, Ca, Mg, and Fe in digestate. Zhang et al. (2020) [195]  
751 reported a similar rise of nutrient content in digestate amended with BC, even if  
752 concentrations of certain nutrients did not fully meet limits of EU regulation on fertilizing  
753 products (Regulation EU 2019/1009). Research has shown that the joint amendment of  
754 BC and anaerobic digestate can reduce atmospheric greenhouses emissions from fields,  
755 such as N<sub>2</sub>O [196] and CO<sub>2</sub> [197–199]. A mixture of dried anaerobic digestate and BC  
756 may be an alternative to standard formulations in horticultural potting media [200]. In  
757 addition, BC may contribute to improve the composting of digestate [153,201,202],  
758 particularly in terms of process performance, compost quality and its benefits on plants  
759 [203–205].

760 Further research is needed to understand interactions between BC, digestate and soil for  
761 the potential use of the mixture as soil improver after AD. Future studies about the use of  
762 BC as additive in AD should also consider its effects on the agronomic value of anaerobic  
763 sludge (i.e. content in macro- and micro-nutrients, germination and phytotoxicity tests,  
764 and others [206]).

765 *4.5. Effects on biogas upgrading*

766 Raw biogas from AD consists mainly of CH<sub>4</sub> (50-70 % v/v) and CO<sub>2</sub> (30-50 % v/v), along  
767 with minor compounds as water vapour, H<sub>2</sub>S, NH<sub>3</sub>, O<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub> [207]. Upgrading and  
768 cleaning biogas are required to meet the requirements and standards for engines and  
769 pipelines, although they represent energetic and economic costs up to 55 % of the total  
770 biomethane production cost [33,208,209]. To date, conventional technologies involve  
771 water scrubbing, cryogenic separation, physico-chemical absorption, and membranes,  
772 among the others [210,211]. Recently, BC has been investigated as adsorbent of CO<sub>2</sub> and  
773 H<sub>2</sub>S for in-situ and ex-situ applications, as addressed in the following paragraphs.

774 *4.5.1. In-situ biogas upgrading*

775 A series of studies [24,33,34,151] investigated the feasibility of in-situ biogas upgrading  
776 by the addition of BC, obtaining methane contents up to pipeline quality (Table 10). Shen  
777 et al. (2015) [151] investigated the possibility of sequestering CO<sub>2</sub> with BC during  
778 thermophilic AD of WAS for in-situ biogas cleaning and upgrading. They reported  
779 average methane contents of 88.5-96.7 % in BC amended reactors, compared to 67.9 %  
780 in control reactor, reaching CO<sub>2</sub> removals of 54.9-86.3 % and residual H<sub>2</sub>S content below  
781 5 ppb. They suggested that CO<sub>2</sub> removal could be promoted by the high porosity of BC,  
782 by the large SSA rich of basic sites and of hydrophobic sites. Shen et al. (2016) [33]  
783 assessed the AD of WAS with the addition of two woody BCs. They observed average  
784 methane content up to 92.3 % and 79.0 % in biogas from BCs amended reactors in  
785 mesophilic and thermophilic conditions compared to control reactors, corresponding to  
786 CO<sub>2</sub> removals by up to 66.2 % and 32.4 %, respectively. They stated that both BCs owned  
787 desirable properties for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration, and in particular high values of: SSA, porosity,

788 chemical stability, degree of carbonization and alkaline nature. Linville et al. (2017) [24]  
789 investigated the influence of particle size and dose of BC from walnut shell on AD of FW  
790 in mesophilic and thermophilic conditions. They found higher CO<sub>2</sub> removals compared  
791 to control reactors in the case of smaller particle size of BC (61.0 %) than coarse one  
792 (51.0 %), due to the larger SSA and ash content. However, according to other studies  
793 [33,151], they observed a reduction of methane production with higher BC doses,  
794 concluding that this could lead to inhibition caused by higher concentrations of cations  
795 released by the BC. Shen et al. (2017) [34] studied the effects of two BCs from corn stover  
796 and pine wood on AD of WAS in two-stage digesters. They reported an average methane  
797 content of 81.0-88.6 % in the reactor with BC from corn stover and 72.1-76.6 % with BC  
798 from pine wood, compared to around 70.0 % for the control. They stated that BCs would  
799 release base cations sequestering CO<sub>2</sub> by chemical sorption and forming  
800 bicarbonate/carbonate salts, and that its surface structure would help CO<sub>2</sub> adsorption.  
801 Apart from CO<sub>2</sub> adsorption on BC, the major formation of CH<sub>4</sub> depends on the stronger  
802 syntrophic cooperation between organic acid-oxidising bacteria and CO<sub>2</sub> reducing  
803 methanogens [36,58], underlying the key role of efficient interspecies electron transfers.  
804 Further confirmation by other authors to the attractive findings about biogas in-situ  
805 upgrading by BC would be beneficial.

#### 806 *4.5.2. Ex-situ biogas cleaning and upgrading*

807 The use of BC and other carbonaceous adsorbents for CO<sub>2</sub> capture from various gaseous  
808 streams recently attracted a growing attention [212–214]. Considering ex-situ  
809 applications of BC for biogas upgrading and cleaning, Table 11 shows CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>S  
810 adsorption capacity of different BCs. Clearly, the adsorption capacity for both CO<sub>2</sub> and  
811 H<sub>2</sub>S is in a wide range, 0.4-2.3 mmol g<sup>-1</sup> and 0.2-19.1 mmol g<sup>-1</sup> respectively. Most of the

812 studies regarding CO<sub>2</sub> capture do not specifically focus on biogas, investigating different  
813 BCs eventually subjected to activation. Sethupathi et al. (2017) [215] assessed the  
814 adsorption of CH<sub>4</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>S in a synthetic biogas stream by four BCs in fixed bed  
815 adsorbers during continuous experiments. They reported that just CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>S were  
816 captured by BCs, which exhibited adsorption capacities up to 0.208 mmol g<sup>-1</sup> for H<sub>2</sub>S and  
817 0.126 mmol g<sup>-1</sup> for CO<sub>2</sub>. Creamer et al. (2014) [216] investigated the adsorption of CO<sub>2</sub>  
818 into BCs from bagasse and hickory wood. They found that BC could effectively capture  
819 CO<sub>2</sub> (adsorption capacity up to 73.55 mg g<sup>-1</sup> or 1.67 mmol g<sup>-1</sup>), suggesting the importance  
820 of surface area and superficial nitrogen groups in CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration, mainly through  
821 physical adsorption. Creamer and Gao (2016) [217] reported that the main mechanism  
822 for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration by BC is physical adsorption, suggesting the importance of high  
823 SSA [100], adequate pore size (0.5-0.8 nm) [218] and pore volume, thanks to Van der  
824 Waals and electrostatic forces. However, the adsorption of CO<sub>2</sub> can also be influenced by  
825 BC chemical properties, such as the presence of basic surface functional groups or alkali  
826 and alkaline earth metals, hydrophobicity and non-polarity [214]. For instance, Xu et al.  
827 (2016) [219] found that the adsorption of CO<sub>2</sub> by three BCs during batch equilibrium tests  
828 was due to the presence of alkali and alkaline earth metals (Ca, Fe, K, Mg) by CO<sub>2</sub>  
829 mineralogical reactions together with physical sorption. Activation and surface treatments  
830 of BCs can provide high surface area and micropores for physical sorption and enrich  
831 surface functional groups and metal oxides for chemical sorption, leading to remarkable  
832 CO<sub>2</sub> adsorption capacities (5.0-7.4 mmol g<sup>-1</sup>) [220].  
833 Other studies applied BC for removing H<sub>2</sub>S from biogas (Table 11). Sahota et al. 2018  
834 [221] found 84.2 % removal of H<sub>2</sub>S from biogas with BC from leaf waste. Kanjanarong  
835 et al. (2017) [222] obtained a removal of 98 % of H<sub>2</sub>S (8.02 mmol g<sup>-1</sup>) from biogas with

836 BC, suggesting carboxylic and hydroxide radical groups as responsible of H<sub>2</sub>S adsorption.  
 837 Finally, Pelaez-Samaniego et al. (2018) [37] found that BC from AD digestate could  
 838 effectively remove H<sub>2</sub>S from a synthetic biogas, possibly facilitated by the presence of  
 839 ash, porosity, or aromatics in BC. In contrast with CO<sub>2</sub> for which adsorption onto BC  
 840 seemed to be mainly physical, absorption of H<sub>2</sub>S seemed to involve many chemical  
 841 mechanisms with BC surface [223].  
 842 Overall, biochar seems to be a promising adsorbent for ex-situ biogas cleaning and  
 843 upgrading applications. However, additional studies [215] should focus on the adsorption  
 844 of CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>S along with NH<sub>3</sub> from real or synthetic biogas, considering their  
 845 competitive adsorptions, along with the influence of water vapour and the eventual  
 846 removal of CH<sub>4</sub>.

847

848 Table 10. Physic-chemical properties of biochars used in biogas in-situ upgrading

Feedstock	Production temperature [°C]	BET-SA [m <sup>2</sup> g <sup>-1</sup> ]	Total pore volume [cm <sup>3</sup> g <sup>-1</sup> ]	Average pore diameter [nm]	H/C [molar ratio]	O/C [molar ratio]	Ash [% wt]	Reference
Corn stover	Gasification	315.30	0.09	6.50	0.075 ± 0.007	0.004 ± 0.001	45.18 ± 0.40	[34,151]
Pine pellets	Gasification	310.19	0.19	5.07	0.078 ± 0.009	0.249 ± 0.014	18.69 ± 0.44	[33,34]
White oak pellets	Gasification	296.81	0.15	4.92	0.109 ± 0.026	0.051 ± 0.010	34.90 ± 0.65	
Walnut shell	Gasification: 900 °C	86.5	0.16	7.06	0.20 ± 0.01	0.06 ± 0.01	43.2 ± 0.2	[24]

849

850 Table 11. Biochar adsorption capacity (mmol g<sup>-1</sup>) of H<sub>2</sub>S and CO<sub>2</sub> during ex-situ  
 851 applications.

Feedstock	Pyrolysis/activation	Surface area [m <sup>2</sup> g <sup>-1</sup> ]	Total pore volume [cm <sup>3</sup> g <sup>-1</sup> ]	Gas	Inlet H <sub>2</sub> S or CO <sub>2</sub> concentration [ppm]	H <sub>2</sub> S Adsorption capacity [mmol g <sup>-1</sup> ]	CO <sub>2</sub> Adsorption capacity [mmol g <sup>-1</sup> ]	Reference
-----------	----------------------	--	--	-----	---	--	---	-----------

AD digestate fibres	PY/500°C/60 min	134	0.037	Synthetic biogas	2000	3.96 <sup>a</sup>	[37]
	PY/600°C/60min	142	0.035	Synthetic biogas	2000	15.90 <sup>a</sup>	
	PY/600°C/60min +Na <sub>2</sub> CO <sub>3</sub>	-	-	Synthetic biogas	2000	19.13 <sup>a</sup>	
Biomass from black liquor	C/450°C/6min	60		N <sub>2</sub> +H <sub>2</sub> S	1000	2.14 <sup>a</sup>	[224]
Pig manure	PY/500°C/4hours	47.4		Air + H <sub>2</sub> S	1% (v/v)	1.75 <sup>a</sup>	[225]
Sewage sludge	PY/500°C/4hours	71.6		Air + H <sub>2</sub> S	1% (v/v)	1.29 <sup>a</sup>	
Potato peel waste	C/500°C/5min	63		N <sub>2</sub> + H <sub>2</sub> S	1000	1.56 <sup>a</sup>	[226]
Camphor	PY/400°C/5hours	20				3.21 <sup>a</sup>	[227]
Rice hulls	PY/400°C/5hours	115				11.23 <sup>a</sup>	
Bamboos	PY/400°C/5hours	58				9.88 <sup>a</sup>	
80% wood chips 20% AD digestate	PY/600°C			Biogas	1020	8.02 <sup>a</sup>	[222]
Perilla leaf	PY/700°C	473.4	0.1	Synthetic biogas		0.537	2.312 [215]
Korean oak	PY/400°C	270.8	0.1	Synthetic biogas		0.178	0.597
Japanese oak	PY/500°C	475.6	0.2	Synthetic biogas		0.167	0.379
Soybean stover	PY/700°C	420.3	0.2	Synthetic biogas		0.308	0.707
Sawdust	G/850°C	182.0	0.003	N <sub>2</sub> /CO <sub>2</sub>			1.08 <sup>b</sup> [228]
	G/850°C + monoethanolamine	4	0.007	N <sub>2</sub> /CO <sub>2</sub>			3.17 1.02 <sup>b</sup>
Sugarcane bagasse	PY/600°C	401.0					1.67 <sup>b</sup> [216]
Whitewood	PY/500°C + steam activation	840	0.55	He/CO <sub>2</sub>	30 % mol		1.34 <sup>b</sup> [229]
Whitewood	PY/500°C + CO <sub>2</sub> activation	820	0.45	He/CO <sub>2</sub>	30 % mol		1.43 <sup>b</sup>
Whitewood	PY/500°C + KOH activation	1400	0.62	He/CO <sub>2</sub>	30 % mol		1.77 <sup>b</sup>
Walnut shell	C900°C/1.5hours	397	0.198				1.65 <sup>b</sup> [230]
Pig manure	PY/500°C/4hours	31.57	0.044	N <sub>2</sub> /CO <sub>2</sub>			0.53 <sup>b</sup> [219]
Wheat straw	PY/500°C/4hours	20.20	0.041	N <sub>2</sub> /CO <sub>2</sub>			0.78 <sup>b</sup>
Sewage sludge	PY/500°C/4hours	10.12	0.022	N <sub>2</sub> /CO <sub>2</sub>			0.41 <sup>b</sup>

## 852 **5. Economic and environmental assessments**

853 An economic and environmental evaluation of BC production and application in AD was  
854 performed, considering specifically four perspectives: 1. BC production according to  
855 feedstock composition and 2. to pyrolysis process conditions; 3. BC application in AD  
856 compared to current state of the art technologies addressing AD challenges; 4. integration  
857 of AD and pyrolysis processes (to our knowledge, specific studies related to the economic  
858 and environmental assessment of BC use in AD processes are not available).

### 859 *5.1. Economic assessment*

860 Considering BC production, the key parameters to evaluate the economic benefits of  
861 feedstocks (perspective 1) are: ash and lignin contents and O/C ratio, which affect  
862 pyrolysis yield, molecular weight of bio-oil and BC amount production [231]. Li et al.  
863 (2017) [232], based on regression model applied to 346 lignocellulosic feedstocks, stated  
864 that higher ash content increases BC production in a range of 12.5-15.5 %, reducing bio-  
865 oil production, and consequently the incomes coming out from bio-oil trade, which makes  
866 pyrolysis economically profitable. With lower ash content and higher O/C ratio of  
867 feedstocks, higher biofuel yields are produced, which leads to better economic  
868 performance, in fact minimum fuel selling prices for lignocellulosic feedstocks ranged  
869 from 0.53-1.1 Euro/L.

870 Considering the pyrolysis process (perspective 2), the investment costs for BC production  
871 from lignocellulosic feedstocks are: 43 % for pre-treatment and pyrolysis, 35 % for H<sub>2</sub>  
872 generation and 22 % for cooling and fractionations [232]. The average operating cost  
873 varies from 0.68 Euro/L for woody biomass to 0.86 Euro/L for straw biomass, due to the  
874 higher costs of disposal and pre-treatment of straw biomass, respectively 32 % and 34 %

875 of total operational costs [233]. Based on the economic analysis performed by Harsono  
 876 et al. (2013) [234] and Sahoo et al. (2019) [235], the investment and operational costs  
 877 related to BC production from lignocellulosic feedstock can only be balanced by a BC  
 878 trade price of 470 Euro/t.

879 Considering perspective 3, the need to enhance AD feasibility and applicability to  
 880 unconventional substrates implied higher costs, which should be exceeded by the  
 881 increased methane production and therefore by the additional electric energy potentially  
 882 associated. Inorganic and biological additives as iron, micronutrients and ash are  
 883 conventionally employed to reduce inhibition and facilitate organic matter solubilisation,  
 884 thus improving methane production. Nevertheless, the application of additives in AD  
 885 accounts as 3.60-4.10 euro/L of enzyme and as 13-16 euro/L of nutrients [236]. The  
 886 overall costs of BC, depending on feedstock, pyrolysis process and activating agent  
 887 (Table 12), could range from 0.2 to 0.5 USD/kg, making BC cheaper than granular  
 888 activated carbon (GAC), which has production costs ranging between 0.6 and 20 USD/kg.  
 889

890 Table 12. Comparison of granular activated carbon (GAC) and biochar (BC) production  
 891 costs depending on feedstock, production process and activating agent

Additive	Feedstock	Production process/ Activating agent	Location	Cost of production (USD kg <sup>-1</sup> )	Reference
GAC	Poultry litter derived carbon	Steam	USA	1.44	[237]
GAC	Rice bran	NaOH	China	3.58-3.77	[237]
GAC	Red oak wood	Steam	USA	0.62-1.27	[237]
GAC - commercial	-	-	USA	1.19-16.34	[237]
GAC	Fruit processing waste	Steam	Malaysia	1.67	[237]
GAC	Rice bran	CO <sub>2</sub>	Brazil	3.54	[237]

GAC	Acid treated rice bran	CO <sub>2</sub>	Brazil	20.45	[237]
GAC	Wood	KOH	-	2.49	[237]
GAC	Charcoal	KOH	-	1.25	[237]
GAC	Lignite	KOH	-	2.18	[237]
GAC - commercial				1.93	[237]
BC	Empty fruit bunches	Slow PY	Malaysia	0.533	[234]
BC	Straw	Slow PY (large scale)	UK	0.203	[18]
BC	Straw	Slow PY (medium scale)	UK	0.447	[18]
BC	Straw	Slow PY (small scale)	UK	0.351	[18]
BC	Short rotation coppicing, forestry residues, short rotation forestry	Slow PY (large scale)	UK	0.266	[18]
BC	Short rotation coppicing, forestry residues, short rotation forestry	Slow PY (medium scale)	UK	0.500	[18]
BC	Short rotation coppicing	Slow PY (small scale)	UK	0.434	[18]
BC	Forestry residue	Slow PY (large scale)	UK	0.345	[18]
BC	Forestry residue	Slow PY (medium scale)	UK	0.584	[18]
BC	Arboricultural arisings	Slow PY (small scale)	UK	0.213	[18]
BC	Pine wood	Slow PY	USA	0.220-0.280	[238]
BC	-	-	European market (2014)	0.662-0.811 <sup>a</sup>	[239]
BC	-	-	-	0.207	[239]
BC	-	-	-	0.600	[68]
BC	-	-	Global, market price (mean)	2.06	[240]
BC	-	-	USA, market price (mean)	2.48 (0.08-13.48)	[241]

GAC: granular activated carbon; PY: pyrolysis.

(a) exchange rate USD/euro (January 2014): 1.3516

893 Still considering perspective 3 and moving from the additive's cost to the improvement  
894 of AD performances,  
895 The economic benefits of the integration of AD and pyrolysis technologies (perspective  
896 4) has been explored by literature. The integrated technologies of AD of waste biomass  
897 and pyrolysis of the digestate could increase the net electricity production respect to AD  
898 alone [80] and enhance its quality as soil amendment [81] with economic and  
899 environmental benefits [242]. However, up to date, there is uncertainty regarding the  
900 balance between input costs of BC supplementation and output of energy production from  
901 AD. Qiu et al. (2019) [59] proposed the energy input-output LCA method to estimate the  
902 total energy input for biogas production, by calculating the energy associated with each  
903 component used in AD, and the actual energy return of investment. Zhang et al. (2020)  
904 [243] investigated the addition of woody BC to improve the thermophilic AD of FW.  
905 They concluded that BC supplementation could be economically feasible to enhance  
906 thermophilic AD of FW.

## 907 *5.2. Environmental assessment*

908 Considering feedstocks (perspective 1), life cycle analysis (LCA) from cradle to cradle  
909 of the pyrolysis of lignocellulosic feedstocks stated that GHG emissions for husk/shell/pit  
910 ranged from 120-250 g CO<sub>2</sub>eq/MJ, while for other organic waste, wood and straw they  
911 ranged between 20-50 g CO<sub>2</sub>eq/MJ [232]. This difference was due to the dominant  
912 contribution of indirect land use change from food production. Feedstocks having higher  
913 O/C ratio and 0 – 2 % ash content increased the GHG emissions [244]. Based on GREET  
914 database [245], GHG emissions reduction for lignocellulosic feedstocks was 85 - 98 %  
915 compared to the GHG emissions for petroleum fuels refining, which was equal to 93

916 gCO<sub>2</sub>eq/MJ. GHG emission reductions for lignocellulosic feedstocks satisfy the 50 %  
917 share of renewable fuel standard for GHG emission reduction requirement for advanced  
918 fuels [246].

919 Considering BC production process (perspective 2), LCA from cradle to gate showed that  
920 BC produced from palm oil empty fruit bunches through slow pyrolysis had an energy  
921 content higher than the energy required for producing BC [234]. Furthermore, LCA  
922 cradle-to grave proved the positive energy balance of BC produced from different  
923 lignocellulosic materials [247]. Hence, the positive energy balance of BC production and  
924 application, due to the high-energy content of lignocellulosic feedstocks, represents a  
925 crucial benefit both from economic and environmental perspectives. One of the main  
926 issue of BC produced from renewable feedstocks as lignocellulose wastes (i.e. WAS,  
927 wood) and not from purpose grown feedstocks is the higher risk of having contaminants  
928 as heavy metals or organic compounds like dioxins, PAHs and PCBs [248].

929 Still considering BC process production (perspective 2), pyrolysis and gasification were  
930 compared from the perspective of carbon equivalent abatement (CA): pyrolysis achieved  
931 the highest CA, ranging from 0.07 to 1.25 t CO<sub>2</sub> eq/t feedstock, as cardboard and wood  
932 waste, while gasification reached the highest electricity generation outputs with 0.9  
933 MWhe/t of feedstocks [249]. Activation was proven to represent a high item cost both in  
934 terms of economic and environmental perspectives [250]. BC chemical activation costs,  
935 in line with non-renewable GAC activation, range between 1.38 and 1.48 Euro/kg,  
936 respectively with acidic and basic treatments [251].

937 However, perspective 2 could also be explored considering the existing literature related  
938 to the conventional applications of BC as soil improver, adsorbent for water and air  
939 pollutants, catalyst for syngas upgrading and biodiesel production (Table 13). LCA

940 studies from cradle-to-grave of conventional BC applications measured in all cases  
941 positive environmental benefits compared to conventional perspectives. BC produced  
942 from waste forestry feedstock and applied as soil improver contributed to GHGs emission  
943 reduction up to 2.74 kg CO<sub>2</sub> eq/ kg BC for the impact categories climate change (CC),  
944 natural gas avoided for fossil depletion (FD) and urea avoided for freshwater  
945 eutrophication (FE) and human toxicity (HT) [252]. A LCA from cradle to cradle [247]  
946 showed that BC production and application as adsorbent presented, compared to GAC  
947 deriving from virgin non-renewable feedstock, lower environmental impacts in terms of  
948 climate change (CC), fossil depletion (FD), freshwater eutrophication (FE) and terrestrial  
949 acidification (TA) impact categories, and that wood and wood chips achieved the highest  
950 environmental credits among the others feedstocks. In details, considering CC (expressed  
951 as kg CO<sub>2</sub>/kg adsorption material), GAC produced 1.44, while wood chips and corn stover  
952 had credits ranging between -3.42 to -3.57, whereas oil palm produced 11.1 [253].  
953 Regarding FE (evaluated as kg P eq/ kg adsorption material), BC from lignocellulosic  
954 feedstock exhibited higher values than GAC, respectively ranging between 6.2 to 10.9 %  
955 [247], due to the organic matter of renewable feedstock [254]. Considering both TA and  
956 FD (respectively estimated as kg SO<sub>2</sub> eq/ kg adsorption material and kg oil eq/ kg  
957 adsorption material), BC from lignocellulosic feedstock achieved higher credits than  
958 GAC, between 9.5 % and 32.0 %.

959 Considering BC application in AD processes (perspective 3), to our knowledge the  
960 available scientific literature only focused on sequential processes, as pyrolysis followed  
961 by AD. A LCA from cradle to grave [255] considered BC produced from corn stover  
962 applied as carburant and soil amendment with sequential AD, achieving respectively: -

963 2.47 kg CO<sub>2</sub>eq/t and energy saving of -6.53 MJ/ t for the first scenario and - 4.67 kg  
 964 CO<sub>2</sub>eq/t and energy saving of -9.73 MJ/ t for the second scenario.

965

966 Table 13. Environmental assessment of biochar (BC) production and uses

	Positive effects	Negative effects
Feedstock (perspective 1)	Lignocellulosic biomass exhibited more positive effects because of higher energy potential [247] Waste biomasses presented more advantages (e.g. avoided waste management) [256]	Feedstock provision (transport) [93] Potential presence of contaminants (heavy metals, persistent organic pollutants) in waste feedstocks (sewage sludge) [256]
Production process (perspective 2)	Renewable energy from syngas and bio-oil [93] Stabilization of C in biomass feedstock [18]	Large centralized pyrolysis units higher transportation distances compared to smaller decentralized units [256]
Activation process (perspective 2)		Activation was proven to represent a high item cost both in terms of economic and environmental perspectives [250]. Use of chemicals and electricity is associated to higher impacts [257].
Applications		
Soil improver	Biochar (C) sequestration in the soil [93] Reduced fertiliser requirements [93] Reduced N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from soil [93] Enhanced plants growth [18] Reduced fossil fuel use in irrigation and cultivation [18] Enhanced nutrient availability [258] Increased H <sub>2</sub> O retention [258] Reduced leaching and run-off of nutrients [258]	Binding /deactivation of pesticides, herbicides and nutrients in soil [258] BC as source of potential toxicants (heavy metals, PAHs, organics) [258]
Adsorbent	BC lower impacts than activated carbon [247]	

967

968

969 In conclusion, focusing the environmental assessment on perspective 4, the integration of

970 AD of waste biomass and pyrolysis of digestate, as shown in Figure 2, could increase the

971 net electricity production respect to AD alone [80] and enhance its quality as soil  
972 amendment [81] with economic and environmental benefits [242]. In conclusion, the  
973 integrated approach has been investigated by life cycle analysis and exhibited positive  
974 environmental outcomes if compared with non-integrated processes [255,259].

## 975 **6. Conclusions**

976 This review addressed three key issues related to the comprehension of BC role in AD  
977 processes:

978 *1. Investigation of the influence of BC properties on AD performances and of their ability*  
979 *to counteract its main challenges.* It is understood that BC properties are determined  
980 by the feedstock and by pyrolysis and activation processes. The key features were  
981 SSA, porous structure and distribution, nature of surface functional groups (related to  
982 CEC and adsorption capacity, buffer capacity, ability to immobilize microbial  
983 communities), elemental composition and ash content. However, some mechanisms  
984 (e.g. BC role in ammonium adsorption and BC influence on microbial mechanisms)  
985 still need to be fully understood and explained. Other challenges for future research  
986 are related to digestate management; in detail, the influence of BC relatively high doses  
987 on the rheological properties of the digestate should be explored, as well as the  
988 eventual leaching of pollutants in the environment as a consequence of digestate  
989 recovery as soil improver.

990 *2. Assessment of the optimal BC production chain (i.e. feedstock-pyrolysis-activation) to*  
991 *achieve the desired features.* Lignocellulosic biomasses, slow pyrolysis and physical  
992 activation seemed to be a good combination in general, while other feedstocks and/or  
993 chemical activation should be evaluated for specific needs and tailor-made applications.

994 However, a systematic investigation of the correlations linking BC physico-chemical  
995 characteristics and AD performances, carefully exploring one by one the BC effects  
996 mentioned in this review, is highly needed for a deep understanding of BC role as  
997 additive in AD processes.

998 *3. Evaluation of the economic and environmental advantages connected to BC use in AD*  
999 *processes, compared to conventional solutions applied to address AD challenges.* The  
1000 main research gap related to this issue is the absence of specific literature related to  
1001 BC use in AD processes, therefore only general statements could be formulated. The  
1002 use of BC as additive could be cheaper and has less environmental impacts than of  
1003 conventional AD improvers (e.g. physico-chemical-biological pre-treatments) and of  
1004 GAC. The integration of AD and pyrolysis achieved economic feasibility and positive  
1005 environmental performances if compared with non-integrated processes. Future  
1006 research could investigate the optimization of technical, economic and environmental  
1007 performances of BC production chain and its integration in AD processes.

### 1008 **Acknowledgements**

1009 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public,  
1010 commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. The authors declare no conflict of interest. Authors'  
1011 contributions: conceptualization: Silvia Fiore and Marco Chiappero; methodology and  
1012 supervision: Silvia Fiore; writing of original draft: all authors; review and editing of the  
1013 manuscript: all authors.

### 1014 **References**

1015 [1] Enerdata. World Energy Consumption Statistics. Glob Energy Stat Yearb 2019.

- 1016 <https://yearbook.enerdata.net/total-energy/world-consumption-statistics.html>  
1017 (accessed April 28, 2020).
- 1018 [2] International Energy Agency (IEA). Statistics | World - Total Primary Energy  
1019 Supply (TPES) by source 2018.  
1020 <https://www.iea.org/statistics/?country=WORLD&year=2016&category=Energy>  
1021 [supply&indicator=TPESbySource&mode=chart&dataTable=BALANCES](https://www.iea.org/statistics/?country=WORLD&year=2016&category=Energy)  
1022 (accessed February 25, 2019).
- 1023 [3] Weiland P. Biogas production: current state and perspectives. *Appl Microbiol*  
1024 *Biotechnol* 2010;85:849–60. doi:10.1007/s00253-009-2246-7.
- 1025 [4] Nkoa R. Agricultural benefits and environmental risks of soil fertilization with  
1026 anaerobic digestates: a review. *Agron Sustain Dev* 2014;34:473–92.  
1027 doi:10.1007/s13593-013-0196-z.
- 1028 [5] Walsh JJ, Jones DL, Edwards-Jones G, Williams AP. Replacing inorganic  
1029 fertilizer with anaerobic digestate may maintain agricultural productivity at less  
1030 environmental cost. *J Plant Nutr Soil Sci* 2012;175:840–5.  
1031 doi:10.1002/jpln.201200214.
- 1032 [6] Ward AJ, Hobbs PJ, Holliman PJ, Jones DL. Optimisation of the anaerobic  
1033 digestion of agricultural resources. *Bioresour Technol* 2008;99:7928–40.  
1034 doi:10.1016/J.BIORTECH.2008.02.044.
- 1035 [7] Appels L, Lauwers J, Degève J, Helsen L, Lievens B, Willems K, et al.  
1036 Anaerobic digestion in global bio-energy production: Potential and research  
1037 challenges. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev* 2011;15:4295–301.  
1038 doi:10.1016/J.RSER.2011.07.121.
- 1039 [8] European Biogas Association (EBA). Statistical report, 2019 2019.

1040 <https://www.europeanbiogas.eu/eba-statistical-report-2019> (accessed May 8,  
1041 2020).

1042 [9] Mata-Alvarez J, Dosta J, Romero-Güiza MS, Fonoll X, Peces M, Astals S. A  
1043 critical review on anaerobic co-digestion achievements between 2010 and 2013.  
1044 *Renew Sustain Energy Rev* 2014;36:412–27. doi:10.1016/J.RSER.2014.04.039.

1045 [10] Taherzadeh M, Karimi K, Taherzadeh MJ, Karimi K. Pretreatment of  
1046 Lignocellulosic Wastes to Improve Ethanol and Biogas Production: A Review.  
1047 *Int J Mol Sci* 2008;9:1621–51. doi:10.3390/ijms9091621.

1048 [11] Carrere H, Antonopoulou G, Affes R, Passos F, Battimelli A, Lyberatos G, et al.  
1049 Review of feedstock pretreatment strategies for improved anaerobic digestion:  
1050 From lab-scale research to full-scale application. *Bioresour Technol*  
1051 2016;199:386–97. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2015.09.007.

1052 [12] Arif S, Liaquat R, Adil M. Applications of materials as additives in anaerobic  
1053 digestion technology. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev* 2018;97:354–66.  
1054 doi:10.1016/j.rser.2018.08.039.

1055 [13] Ye M, Liu J, Ma C, Li Y-Y, Zou L, Qian G, et al. Improving the stability and  
1056 efficiency of anaerobic digestion of food waste using additives: A critical review.  
1057 *J Clean Prod* 2018;192:316–26. doi:10.1016/J.JCLEPRO.2018.04.244.

1058 [14] Romero-Güiza MS, Vila J, Mata-Alvarez J, Chimenos JM, Astals S. The role of  
1059 additives on anaerobic digestion: A review. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev*  
1060 2016;58:1486–99. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2015.12.094.

1061 [15] González J, Sánchez M, Gómez X. Enhancing Anaerobic Digestion: The Effect  
1062 of Carbon Conductive Materials. *J Carbon Res* 2018;4:59.  
1063 doi:10.3390/c4040059.

- 1064 [16] Zhang J, Zhao W, Zhang H, Wang Z, Fan C, Zang L. Recent achievements in  
1065 enhancing anaerobic digestion with carbon- based functional materials. *Bioresour*  
1066 *Technol* 2018;266:555–67. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2018.07.076.
- 1067 [17] Nanda S, Dalai AK, Berruti F, Kozinski JA. Biochar as an Exceptional  
1068 Bioresource for Energy, Agronomy, Carbon Sequestration, Activated Carbon and  
1069 Specialty Materials. *Waste and Biomass Valorization* 2016;7:201–35.  
1070 doi:10.1007/s12649-015-9459-z.
- 1071 [18] Lehmann J, Joseph S. Biochar for environmental management: science,  
1072 technology and implementation. II. Earthscan from Routledge; 2015.
- 1073 [19] Fagbohunge MO, Herbert BMJ, Hurst L, Ibeto CN, Li H, Usmani SQ, et al. The  
1074 challenges of anaerobic digestion and the role of biochar in optimizing anaerobic  
1075 digestion. *Waste Manag* 2017;61:236–49. doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2016.11.028.
- 1076 [20] Pecchi M, Baratieri M. Coupling anaerobic digestion with gasification, pyrolysis  
1077 or hydrothermal carbonization: A review. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev* 2019.  
1078 doi:10.1016/j.rser.2019.02.003.
- 1079 [21] Fabbri D, Torri C. Linking pyrolysis and anaerobic digestion (Py-AD) for the  
1080 conversion of lignocellulosic biomass. *Curr Opin Biotechnol* 2016;38:167–73.  
1081 doi:10.1016/j.copbio.2016.02.004.
- 1082 [22] Hübner T, Mumme J. Integration of pyrolysis and anaerobic digestion - Use of  
1083 aqueous liquor from digestate pyrolysis for biogas production. *Bioresour Technol*  
1084 2015;183:86–92. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2015.02.037.
- 1085 [23] Salman CA, Schwede S, Thorin E, Yan J. Enhancing biomethane production by  
1086 integrating pyrolysis and anaerobic digestion processes. *Appl Energy*  
1087 2017;204:1074–83. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.05.006.

- 1088 [24] Linville JL, Shen Y, Ignacio-de Leon PA, Schoene RP, Urgun-Demirtas M. In-  
1089 situ biogas upgrading during anaerobic digestion of food waste amended with  
1090 walnut shell biochar at bench scale. *Waste Manag Res* 2017;35:669–79.  
1091 doi:10.1177/0734242X17704716.
- 1092 [25] Torri C, Fabbri D. Biochar enables anaerobic digestion of aqueous phase from  
1093 intermediate pyrolysis of biomass. *Bioresour Technol* 2014;172:335–41.  
1094 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2014.09.021.
- 1095 [26] Sunyoto NMS, Zhu M, Zhang Z, Zhang D. Effect of biochar addition on  
1096 hydrogen and methane production in two-phase anaerobic digestion of aqueous  
1097 carbohydrates food waste. *Bioresour Technol* 2016;219:29–36.  
1098 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2016.07.089.
- 1099 [27] Jang HM, Choi YK, Kan E. Effects of dairy manure-derived biochar on  
1100 psychrophilic, mesophilic and thermophilic anaerobic digestions of dairy manure.  
1101 *Bioresour Technol* 2018;250:927–31. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2017.11.074.
- 1102 [28] Sun C, Liu F, Song Z, Wang J, Li Y, Pan Y, et al. Feasibility of dry anaerobic  
1103 digestion of beer lees for methane production and biochar enhanced performance  
1104 at mesophilic and thermophilic temperature. *Bioresour Technol* 2019;276:65–73.  
1105 doi:10.1016/J.BIORTECH.2018.12.105.
- 1106 [29] Zhao Z, Zhang Y, Woodard TL, Nevin KP, Lovley DR. Enhancing syntrophic  
1107 metabolism in up-flow anaerobic sludge blanket reactors with conductive carbon  
1108 materials. *Bioresour Technol* 2015;191:140–5.  
1109 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2015.05.007.
- 1110 [30] Inthapanya S, Preston TR, Leng RA. Biochar increases biogas production in a  
1111 batch digester charged with cattle manure. *Livest Res Rural Dev* 2012;24.

- 1112 [31] Inthapanya S, Preston TR. Biochar marginally increases biogas production but  
1113 decreases methane content of the gas in continuous-flow biodigesters charged  
1114 with cattle manure. *Livest Res Rural Dev* 2013;25.
- 1115 [32] Bruun EW, Müller-Stöver D, Ambus P, Hauggaard-Nielsen H. Application of  
1116 biochar to soil and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions: potential effects of blending fast-pyrolysis  
1117 biochar with anaerobically digested slurry. *Eur J Soil Sci* 2011;62:581–9.  
1118 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2389.2011.01377.x.
- 1119 [33] Shen Y, Linville JL, Ignacio-de Leon PAA, Schoene RP, Urgun-Demirtas M.  
1120 Towards a sustainable paradigm of waste-to-energy process: Enhanced anaerobic  
1121 digestion of sludge with woody biochar. *J Clean Prod* 2016;135:1054–64.  
1122 doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.06.144.
- 1123 [34] Shen Y, Forrester S, Koval J, Urgun-Demirtas M. Yearlong semi-continuous  
1124 operation of thermophilic two-stage anaerobic digesters amended with biochar  
1125 for enhanced biomethane production. *J Clean Prod* 2017;167:863–74.  
1126 doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.05.135.
- 1127 [35] Codignole Luz F, Cordiner S, Manni A, Mulone V, Rocco V. Biochar  
1128 characteristics and early applications in anaerobic digestion—a review. *J Environ*  
1129 *Chem Eng* 2018;6:2892–909. doi:10.1016/j.jece.2018.04.015.
- 1130 [36] Masebinu SO, Akinlabi ET, Muzenda E, Aboyade AO. A review of biochar  
1131 properties and their roles in mitigating challenges with anaerobic digestion.  
1132 *Renew Sustain Energy Rev* 2019;103:291–307.  
1133 doi:10.1016/J.RSER.2018.12.048.
- 1134 [37] Pelaez-Samaniego MR, Smith MW, Zhao Q, Garcia-Perez T, Frear C, Garcia-  
1135 Perez M. Charcoal from anaerobically digested dairy fiber for removal of

- 1136 hydrogen sulfide within biogas. *Waste Manag* 2018;76:374–82.  
1137 doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2018.03.011.
- 1138 [38] Wang G, Li Q, Gao X, Wang XC. Synergetic promotion of syntrophic methane  
1139 production from anaerobic digestion of complex organic wastes by biochar:  
1140 Performance and associated mechanisms. *Bioresour Technol* 2018;250:812–20.  
1141 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2017.12.004.
- 1142 [39] Wang D, Ai J, Shen F, Yang G, Zhang Y, Deng S, et al. Improving anaerobic  
1143 digestion of easy-acidification substrates by promoting buffering capacity using  
1144 biochar derived from vermicompost. *Bioresour Technol* 2017;227:286–96.  
1145 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2016.12.060.
- 1146 [40] Fagbohunge MO, Herbert BMJ, Hurst L, Li H, Usmani SQ, Semple KT. Impact  
1147 of biochar on the anaerobic digestion of citrus peel waste. *Bioresour Technol*  
1148 2016;216:142–9. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2016.04.106.
- 1149 [41] Mumme J, Srocke F, Heeg K, Werner M. Use of biochars in anaerobic digestion.  
1150 *Bioresour Technol* 2014;164:189–97. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2014.05.008.
- 1151 [42] Shanmugam SR, Adhikari S, Nam H, Kar Sajib S. Effect of bio-char on methane  
1152 generation from glucose and aqueous phase of algae liquefaction using mixed  
1153 anaerobic cultures. *Biomass and Bioenergy* 2018;108:479–86.  
1154 doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2017.10.034.
- 1155 [43] Su C, Zhao L, Liao L, Qin J, Lu Y, ... QD-J of C, et al. Application of biochar in  
1156 a CIC reactor to relieve ammonia nitrogen stress and promote microbial  
1157 community during food waste treatment. *J Clean Prod* 2019;209:353–62.  
1158 doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.10.269.
- 1159 [44] Lü F, Luo C, Shao L, He P. Biochar alleviates combined stress of ammonium and

1160 acids by firstly enriching Methanosaeta and then Methanosarcina. *Water Res*  
1161 2016;90:34–43. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2015.12.029.

1162 [45] Cruz Viggi C, Simonetti S, Palma E, Pagliaccia P, Braguglia C, Fazi S, et al.  
1163 Enhancing methane production from food waste fermentate using biochar: The  
1164 added value of electrochemical testing in pre-selecting the most effective type of  
1165 biochar. *Biotechnol Biofuels* 2017;10:1–13. doi:10.1186/s13068-017-0994-7.

1166 [46] Li Q, Xu M, Wang G, Chen R, Qiao W, Wang X. Biochar assisted thermophilic  
1167 co-digestion of food waste and waste activated sludge under high feedstock to  
1168 seed sludge ratio in batch experiment. *Bioresour Technol* 2018;249:1009–16.  
1169 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2017.11.002.

1170 [47] Martínez EJ, Rosas JG, Sotres A, Moran A, Cara J, Sánchez ME, et al.  
1171 Codigestion of sludge and citrus peel wastes: Evaluating the effect of biochar  
1172 addition on microbial communities. *Biochem Eng J* 2018;137:314–25.  
1173 doi:10.1016/j.bej.2018.06.010.

1174 [48] Luo C, Lü F, Shao L, He P. Application of eco-compatible biochar in anaerobic  
1175 digestion to relieve acid stress and promote the selective colonization of  
1176 functional microbes. *Water Res* 2015;68:710–8.  
1177 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2014.10.052.

1178 [49] Wang G, Li Q, Gao X, Wang XC. Sawdust-Derived Biochar Much Mitigates  
1179 VFAs Accumulation and Improves Microbial Activities To Enhance Methane  
1180 Production in Thermophilic Anaerobic Digestion. *ACS Sustain Chem Eng*  
1181 2019:acssuschemeng.8b04789. doi:10.1021/acssuschemeng.8b04789.

1182 [50] Wang C, Liu Y, Gao X, Chen H, Xu X, Zhu L. Role of biochar in the granulation  
1183 of anaerobic sludge and improvement of electron transfer characteristics.

- 1184 Bioresour Technol 2018;268:28–35. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2018.07.116.
- 1185 [51] Zhao Z, Zhang Y, Holmes DE, Dang Y, Woodard TL, Nevin KP, et al. Potential  
1186 enhancement of direct interspecies electron transfer for syntrophic metabolism of  
1187 propionate and butyrate with biochar in up-flow anaerobic sludge blanket  
1188 reactors. Bioresour Technol 2016;209:148–56.  
1189 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2016.03.005.
- 1190 [52] Yu HQ, Tay JH, Fang HHP. Effects of Added Powdered and Granular Activated  
1191 Carbons on Start-Up Performance of UASB Reactors. Environ Technol  
1192 1999;20:1095–101. doi:10.1080/09593332008616906.
- 1193 [53] Cooney MJ, Lewis K, Harris K, Zhang Q, Yan T. Start up performance of  
1194 biochar packed bed anaerobic digesters. J Water Process Eng 2016;9:e7–13.  
1195 doi:10.1016/j.jwpe.2014.12.004.
- 1196 [54] Dang Y, Sun D, Woodard TL, Wang LY, Nevin KP, Holmes DE. Stimulation of  
1197 the anaerobic digestion of the dry organic fraction of municipal solid waste  
1198 (OFMSW) with carbon-based conductive materials. Bioresour Technol  
1199 2017;238:30–8. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2017.04.021.
- 1200 [55] Sasaki K, Morita M, Hirano S, Sasaki D, Ohmura N, Igarashi Y. Efficient  
1201 degradation of rice straw in the reactors packed by carbon fiber textiles. Appl  
1202 Microbiol Biotechnol 2010;87:1579–86. doi:10.1007/s00253-010-2667-3.
- 1203 [56] Martins G, Salvador AF, Pereira L, Alves MM. Methane Production and  
1204 Conductive Materials: A Critical Review. Environ Sci Technol 2018;52:10241–  
1205 53. doi:10.1021/acs.est.8b01913.
- 1206 [57] Chen S, Rotaru AE, Shrestha PM, Malvankar NS, Liu F, Fan W, et al. Promoting  
1207 interspecies electron transfer with biochar. Sci Rep 2014;4.

- 1208 doi:10.1038/srep05019.
- 1209 [58] Pan J, Ma J, Zhai L, Luo T, Mei Z, Liu H. Achievements of biochar application  
1210 for enhanced anaerobic digestion: A review. *Bioresour Technol*  
1211 2019;292:122058. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2019.122058.
- 1212 [59] Qiu L, Deng YF, Wang F, Davaritouchaee M, Yao YQ. A review on biochar-  
1213 mediated anaerobic digestion with enhanced methane recovery. *Renew Sustain*  
1214 *Energy Rev* 2019;115:109373. doi:10.1016/J.RSER.2019.109373.
- 1215 [60] Nanda S, Azargohar R, Kozinski JA, Dalai AK. Characteristic Studies on the  
1216 Pyrolysis Products from Hydrolyzed Canadian Lignocellulosic Feedstocks.  
1217 *BioEnergy Res* 2014;7:174–91. doi:10.1007/s12155-013-9359-7.
- 1218 [61] Azargohar R, Nanda S, Kozinski JA, Dalai AK, Sutarto R. Effects of temperature  
1219 on the physicochemical characteristics of fast pyrolysis bio-chars derived from  
1220 Canadian waste biomass. *Fuel* 2014;125:90–100. doi:10.1016/j.fuel.2014.01.083.
- 1221 [62] Azargohar R, Nanda S, Rao BVSK, Dalai AK. Slow Pyrolysis of Deoiled Canola  
1222 Meal: Product Yields and Characterization. *Energy & Fuels* 2013;27:5268–79.  
1223 doi:10.1021/ef400941a.
- 1224 [63] Mohanty P, Nanda S, Pant KK, Naik S, Kozinski JA, Dalai AK. Evaluation of  
1225 the physicochemical development of biochars obtained from pyrolysis of wheat  
1226 straw, timothy grass and pinewood: Effects of heating rate. *J Anal Appl Pyrolysis*  
1227 2013;104:485–93. doi:10.1016/j.jaap.2013.05.022.
- 1228 [64] Kan T, Strezov V, Evans TJ. Lignocellulosic biomass pyrolysis: A review of  
1229 product properties and effects of pyrolysis parameters. *Renew Sustain Energy*  
1230 *Rev* 2016;57:126–1140. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2015.12.185.
- 1231 [65] Garcia-Nunez JA, Pelaez-Samaniego MR, Garcia-Perez ME, Fonts I, Abrego J,

- 1232 Westerhof RJM, et al. Historical Developments of Pyrolysis Reactors: A Review.  
1233 Energy and Fuels 2017;31:5751–75. doi:10.1021/acs.energyfuels.7b00641.
- 1234 [66] Bridgwater A V. Biomass Conversion Technologies: Fast Pyrolysis Liquids from  
1235 Biomass: Quality and Upgrading, Springer, Cham; 2017, p. 55–98.  
1236 doi:10.1007/978-3-319-48288-0\_3.
- 1237 [67] Meier D, Van De Beld B, Bridgwater A V., Elliott DC, Oasmaa A, Preto F.  
1238 State-of-the-art of fast pyrolysis in IEA bioenergy member countries. Renew  
1239 Sustain Energy Rev 2013;20:619–41. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2012.11.061.
- 1240 [68] Yoder J, Galinato S, Granatstein D, Garcia-Pérez M. Economic tradeoff between  
1241 biochar and bio-oil production via pyrolysis. Biomass and Bioenergy  
1242 2011;35:1851–62. doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2011.01.026.
- 1243 [69] Brown RC. Thermochemical processing of biomass conversion into fuels,  
1244 chemicals and power. Wiley; 2011.
- 1245 [70] Hossain MM, Scott IM, Berruti F, Briens C. Application of Novel Pyrolysis  
1246 Reactor Technology to Concentrate Bio-oil Components with Antioxidant  
1247 Activity from Tobacco, Tomato and Coffee Ground Biomass. Waste and  
1248 Biomass Valorization 2018;9:1607–17. doi:10.1007/s12649-017-9943-8.
- 1249 [71] Li D, Berruti F, Briens C. Autothermal fast pyrolysis of woody residues and  
1250 wastes for the production of wood adhesives. In: M. Kuehle-Weidemeier and K.  
1251 Buescher Eds., editor. Waste-to-Resources 2017, Proc. VII Int. Symp. MBT  
1252 MRF, Hann. Ger., Cuvillier Verlag Gottingen; 2017, p. 215–26.
- 1253 [72] Tan X fei, Liu Y guo, Gu Y ling, Xu Y, Zeng G ming, Hu X jiang, et al. Biochar-  
1254 based nano-composites for the decontamination of wastewater: A review.  
1255 Bioresour Technol 2016;212:318–33. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2016.04.093.

- 1256 [73] Shahkarami S, Dalai AK, Soltan J. Enhanced CO<sub>2</sub> Adsorption Using MgO-  
1257 Impregnated Activated Carbon: Impact of Preparation Techniques. *Ind Eng*  
1258 *Chem Res* 2016;55:5955–64. doi:10.1021/acs.iecr.5b04824.
- 1259 [74] Dehkhoda AM, Gyenge E, Ellis N. A novel method to tailor the porous structure  
1260 of KOH-activated biochar and its application in capacitive deionization and  
1261 energy storage. *Biomass and Bioenergy* 2016;87:107–21.  
1262 doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2016.02.023.
- 1263 [75] Briens C, Piskorz J, Berruti F. Biomass Valorization for Fuel and Chemicals  
1264 Production -- A Review. *Int J Chem React Eng* 2008;6. doi:10.2202/1542-  
1265 6580.1674.
- 1266 [76] Ekström C, Lindman N, Pettersson R. Catalytic Conversion of Tars, Carbon  
1267 Black and Methane from Pyrolysis/Gasification of Biomass. *Fundam.*  
1268 *Thermochem. Biomass Convers.*, Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands; 1985, p. 601–  
1269 18. doi:10.1007/978-94-009-4932-4\_34.
- 1270 [77] Lira CS, Berruti FM, Palmisano P, Berruti F, Briens C, Pécora AAB. Fast  
1271 pyrolysis of Amazon tucumã (*Astrocaryum aculeatum*) seeds in a bubbling  
1272 fluidized bed reactor. *J Anal Appl Pyrolysis* 2013;99:23–31.  
1273 doi:10.1016/j.jaap.2012.11.005.
- 1274 [78] Suliman W, Harsh JB, Abu-Lail NI, Fortuna AM, Dallmeyer I, Garcia-Perez M.  
1275 Modification of biochar surface by air oxidation: Role of pyrolysis temperature.  
1276 *Biomass and Bioenergy* 2016;85:1–11. doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2015.11.030.
- 1277 [79] Zhu L, Zhao N, Tong L, Lv Y, Li G. Characterization and evaluation of surface  
1278 modified materials based on porous biochar and its adsorption properties for 2,4-  
1279 dichlorophenoxyacetic acid. *Chemosphere* 2018;210:734–44.

1280 doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2018.07.090.

1281 [80] Monlau F, Sambusiti C, Antoniou N, Barakat A, Zabaniotou A. A new concept  
1282 for enhancing energy recovery from agricultural residues by coupling anaerobic  
1283 digestion and pyrolysis process. *Appl Energy* 2015;148:32–8.  
1284 doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2015.03.024.

1285 [81] Monlau F, Francavilla M, Sambusiti C, Antoniou N, Solhy A, Libutti A, et al.  
1286 Toward a functional integration of anaerobic digestion and pyrolysis for a  
1287 sustainable resource management. Comparison between solid-digestate and its  
1288 derived pyrochar as soil amendment. *Appl Energy* 2016;169:652–62.  
1289 doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.02.084.

1290 [82] Pan J, Ma J, Liu X, Zhai L, Ouyang X, Liu H. Effects of different types of  
1291 biochar on the anaerobic digestion of chicken manure. *Bioresour Technol*  
1292 2019;275:258–65. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2018.12.068.

1293 [83] Wen C. Anaerobic Digestion of Aqueous Pyrolysis Condensate. Electronic  
1294 Thesis and Dissertation Repository, 2018.

1295 [84] Yang Y, Heaven S, Venetsaneas N, Banks CJ, Bridgwater A V. Slow pyrolysis  
1296 of organic fraction of municipal solid waste (OFMSW): Characterisation of  
1297 products and screening of the aqueous liquid product for anaerobic digestion.  
1298 *Appl Energy* 2018;213:158–68. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2018.01.018.

1299 [85] Corton J, Donnison IS, Patel M, Böhle L, Hodgson E, Wachendorf M, et al.  
1300 Expanding the biomass resource: Sustainable oil production via fast pyrolysis of  
1301 low input high diversity biomass and the potential integration of thermochemical  
1302 and biological conversion routes. *Appl Energy* 2016;177:852–62.  
1303 doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.05.088.

- 1304 [86] Elsamadony M, Tawfik A, Suzuki M. Surfactant-enhanced biohydrogen  
1305 production from organic fraction of municipal solid waste (OFMSW) via dry  
1306 anaerobic digestion. *Appl Energy* 2015;149:272–82.  
1307 doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2015.03.127.
- 1308 [87] Monlau F, Sambusiti C, Antoniou N, Zabaniotou A, Solhy A, Barakat A.  
1309 Pyrochars from bioenergy residue as novel bio-adsorbents for lignocellulosic  
1310 hydrolysate detoxification. *Bioresour Technol* 2015;187:379–86.  
1311 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2015.03.137.
- 1312 [88] Erdogan E, Atila B, Mumme J, Reza MT, Toptas A, Elibol M, et al.  
1313 Characterization of products from hydrothermal carbonization of orange pomace  
1314 including anaerobic digestibility of process liquor. *Bioresour Technol*  
1315 2015;196:35–42. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2015.06.115.
- 1316 [89] Dufour A, Castro-Diaz M, Brosse N, Bouroukba M, Snape C. The Origin of  
1317 Molecular Mobility During Biomass Pyrolysis as Revealed by In situ <sup>1</sup>H NMR  
1318 Spectroscopy. *ChemSusChem* 2012;5:1258–65. doi:10.1002/cssc.201100442.
- 1319 [90] Dufour A, Castro-Díaz M, Marchal P, Brosse N, Olcese R, Bouroukba M, et al.  
1320 In Situ Analysis of Biomass Pyrolysis by High Temperature Rheology in  
1321 Relations with <sup>1</sup>H NMR. *Energy & Fuels* 2012;26:6432–41.  
1322 doi:10.1021/ef301310x.
- 1323 [91] Montoya J, Pecha B, Janna FC, Garcia-Perez M. Identification of the fractions  
1324 responsible for morphology conservation in lignocellulosic pyrolysis:  
1325 Visualization studies of sugarcane bagasse and its pseudo-components. *J Anal*  
1326 *Appl Pyrolysis* 2017;123:307–18. doi:10.1016/j.jaap.2016.11.015.
- 1327 [92] Rangabhashiyam S, Balasubramanian P. The potential of lignocellulosic biomass

1328 precursors for biochar production: Performance, mechanism and wastewater  
1329 application—A review. *Ind Crops Prod* 2019;128:405–23.  
1330 doi:10.1016/j.indcrop.2018.11.041.

1331 [93] Meyer S, Glaser B, Quicker P. Technical, economical, and climate-related  
1332 aspects of biochar production technologies: A literature review. *Environ Sci*  
1333 *Technol* 2011;45:9473–83. doi:10.1021/es201792c.

1334 [94] Rousset P, Aguiar C, Labbé N, Commandré JM. Enhancing the combustible  
1335 properties of bamboo by torrefaction. *Bioresour Technol* 2011;102:8225–31.  
1336 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2011.05.093.

1337 [95] Wilk M, Magdziarz A, Kalemba I. Characterisation of renewable fuels’  
1338 torrefaction process with different instrumental techniques. *Energy* 2015;87:259–  
1339 69. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2015.04.073.

1340 [96] Kumar A, Saini K, Bhaskar T. Hydrochar and biochar: Production,  
1341 physicochemical properties and techno-economic analysis. *Bioresour Technol*  
1342 n.d. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2020.123442.

1343 [97] Román S, Nabais JM V, Laginhas C, Ledesma B, González JF. Hydrothermal  
1344 carbonization as an effective way of densifying the energy content of biomass.  
1345 *Fuel Process Technol* 2012;103:78–83. doi:10.1016/j.fuproc.2011.11.009.

1346 [98] Sabio E, Álvarez-Murillo A, Román S, Ledesma B. Conversion of tomato-peel  
1347 waste into solid fuel by hydrothermal carbonization: Influence of the processing  
1348 variables. *Waste Manag* 2016;47:122–32. doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2015.04.016.

1349 [99] Liu Z, Zhang FS, Wu J. Characterization and application of chars produced from  
1350 pinewood pyrolysis and hydrothermal treatment. *Fuel* 2010;89:510–4.  
1351 doi:10.1016/j.fuel.2009.08.042.

- 1352 [100] Hao W, Björkman E, Lilliestråle M, Hedin N. Activated carbons prepared from  
1353 hydrothermally carbonized waste biomass used as adsorbents for CO<sub>2</sub>. *Appl*  
1354 *Energy* 2013;112:526–32. doi:10.1016/J.APENERGY.2013.02.028.
- 1355 [101] Cao X, Zhong L, Peng X, Sun S, Li S, Liu S, et al. Comparative study of the  
1356 pyrolysis of lignocellulose and its major components: Characterization and  
1357 overall distribution of their biochars and volatiles. *Bioresour Technol*  
1358 2014;155:21–7. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2013.12.006.
- 1359 [102] Tan X fei, Liu S bo, Liu Y guo, Gu Y ling, Zeng G ming, Hu X jiang, et al.  
1360 Biochar as potential sustainable precursors for activated carbon production:  
1361 Multiple applications in environmental protection and energy storage. *Bioresour*  
1362 *Technol* 2017;227:359–72. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2016.12.083.
- 1363 [103] Cha JS, Park SH, Jung SC, Ryu C, Jeon JK, Shin MC, et al. Production and  
1364 utilization of biochar: A review. *J Ind Eng Chem* 2016;40:1–15.  
1365 doi:10.1016/j.jiec.2016.06.002.
- 1366 [104] Wongrod S, Simon S, van Hullebusch ED, Lens PNL, Guibaud G. Changes of  
1367 sewage sludge digestate-derived biochar properties after chemical treatments and  
1368 influence on As(III and V) and Cd(II) sorption. *Int Biodeterior Biodegrad*  
1369 2018;135:96–102. doi:10.1016/j.ibiod.2018.10.001.
- 1370 [105] Dalai AK, Azargohar R. Production of Activated Carbon from Biochar Using  
1371 Chemical and Physical Activation: Mechanism and Modeling. In: Argyropoulos  
1372 DS, editor. *Mater. Chem. Energy from For. Biomass*, American Chemical  
1373 Society (ACS); 2007, p. 463–76. doi:10.1021/bk-2007-0954.ch029.
- 1374 [106] You S, Ok YS, Chen SS, Tsang DCW, Kwon EE, Lee J, et al. A critical review  
1375 on sustainable biochar system through gasification: Energy and environmental

- 1376 applications. *Bioresour Technol* 2017;246:242–53.  
1377 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2017.06.177.
- 1378 [107] Li H, Dong X, da Silva EB, de Oliveira LM, Chen Y, Ma LQ. Mechanisms of  
1379 metal sorption by biochars: Biochar characteristics and modifications.  
1380 *Chemosphere* 2017;178:466–78. doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2017.03.072.
- 1381 [108] Chen Y, Zhang X, Chen W, Yang H, Chen H. The structure evolution of biochar  
1382 from biomass pyrolysis and its correlation with gas pollutant adsorption  
1383 performance. *Bioresour Technol* 2017;246:101–9.  
1384 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2017.08.138.
- 1385 [109] Xie T, Reddy KR, Wang C, Yargicoglu E, Spokas K. Characteristics and  
1386 applications of biochar for environmental remediation: A review. *Crit Rev*  
1387 *Environ Sci Technol* 2015;45:939–69. doi:10.1080/10643389.2014.924180.
- 1388 [110] Yuan Y, Bolan N, PrévotEAU A, Vithanage M, Biswas JK, Ok YS, et al.  
1389 Applications of biochar in redox-mediated reactions. *Bioresour Technol*  
1390 2017;246:271–81. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2017.06.154.
- 1391 [111] Qambrani NA, Rahman MM, Won S, Shim S, Ra C. Biochar properties and eco-  
1392 friendly applications for climate change mitigation, waste management, and  
1393 wastewater treatment: A review. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev* 2017;79:255–73.  
1394 doi:10.1016/j.rser.2017.05.057.
- 1395 [112] Yin Q, Zhang B, Wang R, Zhao Z. Biochar as an adsorbent for inorganic  
1396 nitrogen and phosphorus removal from water: a review. *Environ Sci Pollut Res*  
1397 2017;24:26297–309. doi:10.1007/s11356-017-0338-y.
- 1398 [113] Trigo C, Cox L, Spokas K. Influence of pyrolysis temperature and hardwood  
1399 species on resulting biochar properties and their effect on azimsulfuron sorption

1400 as compared to other sorbents. *Sci Total Environ* 2016;566–567:1454–64.  
1401 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.06.027.

1402 [114] Chen T, Zhang Y, Wang H, Lu W, Zhou Z, Zhang Y, et al. Influence of pyrolysis  
1403 temperature on characteristics and heavy metal adsorptive performance of  
1404 biochar derived from municipal sewage sludge. *Bioresour Technol* 2014;164:47–  
1405 54. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2014.04.048.

1406 [115] Collison M, Collison L, Sakrabani R, Tofield B. *Biochar and Carbon*  
1407 *Sequestration: A Regional Perspective* A report prepared for East of England  
1408 Development Agency (EEDA) Biochar and Carbon 2009.

1409 [116] Antal MJ, Grønli M. *The Art, Science, and Technology of Charcoal Production*.  
1410 *Ind Eng Chem Res* 2003;42:1619–1640. doi:10.1021/IE0207919.

1411 [117] Novak JM, Busscher WJ, Laird DL, Ahmedna M, Watts DW, Niandou MAS.  
1412 *Impact of Biochar Amendment on Fertility of a Southeastern Coastal Plain Soil*.  
1413 *Soil Sci* 2009;174:105–12. doi:10.1097/SS.0b013e3181981d9a.

1414 [118] Fiore S, Berruti F, Briens C. Investigation of innovative and conventional  
1415 pyrolysis of ligneous and herbaceous biomasses for biochar production. *Biomass*  
1416 *and Bioenergy* 2018.

1417 [119] Suliman W, Harsh JB, Abu-Lail NI, Fortuna AM, Dallmeyer I, Garcia-Perez M.  
1418 *Influence of feedstock source and pyrolysis temperature on biochar bulk and*  
1419 *surface properties*. *Biomass and Bioenergy* 2016;84:37–48.  
1420 doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2015.11.010.

1421 [120] Tan Z, Lin CSK, Ji X, Rainey TJ. Returning biochar to fields: A review. *Appl*  
1422 *Soil Ecol* 2017;116:1–11. doi:10.1016/j.apsoil.2017.03.017.

1423 [121] Ahmed MB, Zhou JL, Ngo HH, Guo W. Insight into biochar properties and its

- 1424 cost analysis. *Biomass and Bioenergy* 2016;84:76–86.
- 1425 doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2015.11.002.
- 1426 [122] Nguyen BT, Lehmann J. Black carbon decomposition under varying water  
1427 regimes. *Org Geochem* 2009;40:846–53. doi:10.1016/j.orggeochem.2009.05.004.
- 1428 [123] Klüpfel L, Keiluweit M, Kleber M, Sander M. Redox Properties of Plant  
1429 Biomass-Derived Black Carbon (Biochar). *Environ Sci Technol* 2014;48:5601–  
1430 11. doi:10.1021/es500906d.
- 1431 [124] Singh, Balwant, Camps-Arbestain M, Lehmann J, (Eds). *Biochar: a guide to*  
1432 *analytical methods*. CSIRO Publishing; 2017.
- 1433 [125] Appels L, Baeyens J, Degève J, Dewil R. Principles and potential of the  
1434 anaerobic digestion of waste-activated sludge. *Prog Energy Combust Sci*  
1435 2008;34:755–81. doi:10.1016/j.pecs.2008.06.002.
- 1436 [126] Zhang C, Su H, Baeyens J, Tan T. Reviewing the anaerobic digestion of food  
1437 waste for biogas production. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev* 2014;38:383–92.  
1438 doi:10.1016/J.RSER.2014.05.038.
- 1439 [127] Ren Y, Yu M, Wu C, Wang Q, Gao M, Huang Q, et al. A comprehensive review  
1440 on food waste anaerobic digestion: Research updates and tendencies. *Bioresour*  
1441 *Technol* 2018;247:1069–76. doi:10.1016/J.BIORTECH.2017.09.109.
- 1442 [128] Di Maria F, Sordi A, Cirulli G, Micale C. Amount of energy recoverable from an  
1443 existing sludge digester with the co-digestion with fruit and vegetable waste at  
1444 reduced retention time. *Appl Energy* 2015;150:9–14.  
1445 doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2015.01.146.
- 1446 [129] Elalami D, Carrere H, Monlau F, Abdelouahdi K, Oukarroum A, Barakat A.  
1447 Pretreatment and co-digestion of wastewater sludge for biogas production:

- 1448 Recent research advances and trends. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev*  
1449 2019;114:109287. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2019.109287.
- 1450 [130] Nghiem LD, Koch K, Bolzonella D, Drewes JE. Full scale co-digestion of  
1451 wastewater sludge and food waste: Bottlenecks and possibilities. *Renew Sustain*  
1452 *Energy Rev* 2017;72:354–62. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2017.01.062.
- 1453 [131] Kang X, Sun Y, Li L, Kong X, Yuan Z. Improving methane production from  
1454 anaerobic digestion of Pennisetum Hybrid by alkaline pretreatment. *Bioresour*  
1455 *Technol* 2018;255:205–12. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2017.12.001.
- 1456 [132] Novais RM, Gameiro T, Carvalheiras J, Seabra MP, Tarelho LAC, Labrincha JA,  
1457 et al. High pH buffer capacity biomass fly ash-based geopolymer spheres to boost  
1458 methane yield in anaerobic digestion. *J Clean Prod* 2018;178:258–67.  
1459 doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.01.033.
- 1460 [133] Novais RM, Buruberri LH, Seabra MP, Bajare D, Labrincha JA. Novel porous  
1461 fly ash-containing geopolymers for pH buffering applications. *J Clean Prod*  
1462 2016;124:395–404. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.02.114.
- 1463 [134] Wei W, Guo W, Ngo HH, Mannina G, Wang D, Chen X, et al. Enhanced high-  
1464 quality biomethane production from anaerobic digestion of primary sludge by  
1465 corn stover biochar. *Bioresour Technol* 2020;306:123159.  
1466 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2020.123159.
- 1467 [135] Ambaye TG, Rene ER, Dupont C, Wongrod S, van Hullebusch ED. Anaerobic  
1468 Digestion of Fruit Waste Mixed With Sewage Sludge Digestate Biochar:  
1469 Influence on Biomethane Production. *Front Energy Res* 2020;8:31.  
1470 doi:10.3389/fenrg.2020.00031.
- 1471 [136] Qiang H, Lang DL, Li YY. High-solid mesophilic methane fermentation of food

1472 waste with an emphasis on Iron, Cobalt, and Nickel requirements. *Bioresour*  
1473 *Technol* 2012;103:21–7. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2011.09.036.

1474 [137] Chen Y, Cheng JJ, Creamer KS. Inhibition of anaerobic digestion process: A  
1475 review. *Bioresour Technol* 2008;99:4044–64.  
1476 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2007.01.057.

1477 [138] Wang G, Li Q, Li Y, Xing Y, Yao G, Liu Y, et al. Redox-active biochar  
1478 facilitates potential electron transfer between syntrophic partners to enhance  
1479 anaerobic digestion under high organic loading rate. *Bioresour Technol*  
1480 2020;298:122524. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2019.122524.

1481 [139] Qin Y, Wang H, Li X, Cheng JJ, Wu W. Improving methane yield from organic  
1482 fraction of municipal solid waste (OFMSW) with magnetic rice-straw biochar.  
1483 *Bioresour Technol* 2017;245:1058–66. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2017.09.047.

1484 [140] Rajagopal R, Massé DI, Singh G. A critical review on inhibition of anaerobic  
1485 digestion process by excess ammonia. *Bioresour Technol* 2013;143:632–41.  
1486 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2013.06.030.

1487 [141] Zhang Y, Zamudio Cañas EM, Zhu Z, Linville JL, Chen S, He Q. Robustness of  
1488 archaeal populations in anaerobic co-digestion of dairy and poultry wastes.  
1489 *Bioresour Technol* 2011;102:779–85. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2010.08.104.

1490 [142] Ho L, Ho G. Mitigating ammonia inhibition of thermophilic anaerobic treatment  
1491 of digested piggery wastewater: Use of pH reduction, zeolite, biomass and humic  
1492 acid. *Water Res* 2012;46:4339–50. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2012.05.016.

1493 [143] Poirier S, Madigou C, Bouchez T, Chapleur O. Improving anaerobic digestion  
1494 with support media: Mitigation of ammonia inhibition and effect on microbial  
1495 communities. *Bioresour Technol* 2017;235:229–39.

1496 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2017.03.099.

1497 [144] Yenigün O, Demirel B. Ammonia inhibition in anaerobic digestion: A review.  
 1498 Process Biochem 2013;48:901–11. doi:10.1016/j.procbio.2013.04.012.

1499 [145] Yun YM, Kim DH, Cho SK, Shin HS, Jung KW, Kim HW. Mitigation of  
 1500 ammonia inhibition by internal dilution in high-rate anaerobic digestion of food  
 1501 waste leachate and evidences of microbial community response. Biotechnol  
 1502 Bioeng 2016;113:1892–901. doi:10.1002/bit.25968.

1503 [146] Fang C, Boe K, Angelidaki I. Anaerobic co-digestion of desugared molasses with  
 1504 cow manure; focusing on sodium and potassium inhibition. Bioresour Technol  
 1505 2011;102:1005–11. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2010.09.077.

1506 [147] Wang Q, Yang Y, Yu C, Huang H, Kim M, Feng C, et al. Study on a fixed  
 1507 zeolite bioreactor for anaerobic digestion of ammonium-rich swine wastes.  
 1508 Bioresour Technol 2011;102:7064–8. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2011.04.085.

1509 [148] Wang W, Ren X, Yang K, Hu Z, Yuan S. Inhibition of ammonia on anaerobic  
 1510 digestion of synthetic coal gasification wastewater and recovery using struvite  
 1511 precipitation. J Hazard Mater 2017;340:152–9.  
 1512 doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2017.07.002.

1513 [149] Zhang Y, Angelidaki I. Counteracting ammonia inhibition during anaerobic  
 1514 digestion by recovery using submersible microbial desalination cell. Biotechnol  
 1515 Bioeng 2015;112:1478–82. doi:10.1002/bit.25549.

1516 [150] Ghyselbrecht K, Monballiu A, Somers MH, Sigurnjak I, Meers E, Appels L, et  
 1517 al. Stripping and scrubbing of ammonium using common fractionating columns  
 1518 to prove ammonium inhibition during anaerobic digestion. Int J Energy Environ  
 1519 Eng 2018;9:447–55. doi:10.1007/s40095-018-0283-7.

- 1520 [151] Shen Y, Linville JL, Urgun-Demirtas M, Schoene RP, Snyder SW. Producing  
1521 pipeline-quality biomethane via anaerobic digestion of sludge amended with corn  
1522 stover biochar with in-situ CO<sub>2</sub> removal. *Appl Energy* 2015;158:300–9.  
1523 doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2015.08.016.
- 1524 [152] Ciccoli R, Sperandei M, Petrazzuolo F, Broglia M, Chiarini L, Correnti A, et al.  
1525 Anaerobic digestion of the above ground biomass of Jerusalem Artichoke in a  
1526 pilot plant: Impact of the preservation method on the biogas yield and microbial  
1527 community. *Biomass and Bioenergy* 2018;108:190–7.  
1528 doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2017.11.003.
- 1529 [153] Lü F, Hua Z, Shao L, He P. Loop bioenergy production and carbon sequestration  
1530 of polymeric waste by integrating biochemical and thermochemical conversion  
1531 processes: A conceptual framework and recent advances. *Renew Energy*  
1532 2018;124:202–11. doi:10.1016/j.renene.2017.10.084.
- 1533 [154] Takaya CA, Fletcher LA, Singh S, Anyikude KU, Ross AB. Phosphate and  
1534 ammonium sorption capacity of biochar and hydrochar from different wastes.  
1535 *Chemosphere* 2016;145:518–27. doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2015.11.052.
- 1536 [155] Kizito S, Wu S, Kirui WK, Lei M, Lu Q, Bah H, et al. Evaluation of slow  
1537 pyrolyzed wood and rice husks biochar for adsorption of ammonium nitrogen  
1538 from piggery manure anaerobic digestate slurry. *Sci Total Environ*  
1539 2015;505:102–12. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.09.096.
- 1540 [156] Wang Z, Guo H, Shen F, Yang G, Zhang Y, Zeng Y, et al. Biochar produced  
1541 from oak sawdust by Lanthanum (La)-involved pyrolysis for adsorption of  
1542 ammonium (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>), nitrate (NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>), and phosphate (PO<sub>4</sub><sup>3-</sup>). *Chemosphere*  
1543 2015;119:646–53. doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2014.07.084.

- 1544 [157] Zeng Z, Zhang S, Li T, Zhao F, He Z, Zhao H, et al. Sorption of ammonium and  
1545 phosphate from aqueous solution by biochar derived from phytoremediation  
1546 plants. *J Zhejiang Univ Sci B* 2013;14:1152–61. doi:10.1631/jzus.B1300102.
- 1547 [158] Zhang Y, Li Z, Mahmood IB. Recovery of  $\text{NH}_4^+$  by corn cob produced biochars  
1548 and its potential application as soil conditioner. *Front Environ Sci Eng*  
1549 2014;8:825–34. doi:10.1007/s11783-014-0682-9.
- 1550 [159] Kizito S, Wu S, Wandera SM, Guo L, Dong R. Evaluation of ammonium  
1551 adsorption in biochar-fixed beds for treatment of anaerobically digested swine  
1552 slurry: Experimental optimization and modeling. *Sci Total Environ* 2016;563–  
1553 564:1095–104. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.05.149.
- 1554 [160] Lopez RJ, Higgins SR, Pagaling E, Yan T, Cooney MJ. High rate anaerobic  
1555 digestion of wastewater separated from grease trap waste. *Renew Energy*  
1556 2014;62:234–42. doi:10.1016/j.renene.2013.06.047.
- 1557 [161] Lettinga G. Anaerobic digestion and wastewater treatment systems. *Antonie Van*  
1558 *Leeuwenhoek* 1995;67:3–28. doi:10.1007/BF00872193.
- 1559 [162] Laine J, Simoni S, Calles R. Preparation of activated carbon from coconut shell  
1560 in a small scale cocurrent flow rotary kiln. *Chem Eng Commun* 1991;99:15–23.  
1561 doi:10.1080/00986449108911575.
- 1562 [163] Watanabe Y, Tanaka K. Innovative sludge handling through  
1563 pelletization/thickening. *Water Res* 1999;33:3245–52. doi:10.1016/S0043-  
1564 1354(99)00045-7.
- 1565 [164] Sawayama S, Tada C, Tsukahara K, Yagishita T. Effect of ammonium addition  
1566 on methanogenic community in a fluidized bed anaerobic digestion. *J Biosci*  
1567 *Bioeng* 2004;97:65–70. doi:10.1016/S1389-1723(04)70167-X.

- 1568 [165] Stams AJM. Metabolic interactions between anaerobic bacteria in methanogenic  
1569 environments. *Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek* 1994;66:271–94.  
1570 doi:10.1007/BF00871644.
- 1571 [166] Whitman WB, Bowen TL, Boone DR. *The Methanogenic Bacteria. The*  
1572 *Prokaryotes*, New York, NY: Springer New York; 2006, p. 165–207.  
1573 doi:10.1007/0-387-30743-5\_9.
- 1574 [167] Morris BEL, Henneberger R, Huber H, Moissl-Eichinger C. Microbial syntrophy:  
1575 Interaction for the common good. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 2013;37:384–406.  
1576 doi:10.1111/1574-6976.12019.
- 1577 [168] Schink B, Montag D, Keller A, Müller N. Hydrogen or formate: Alternative key  
1578 players in methanogenic degradation. *Environ Microbiol Rep* 2017;9:189–202.  
1579 doi:10.1111/1758-2229.12524.
- 1580 [169] Lovley DR, Fraga JL, Coates JD, Blunt-Harris EL. Humics as an electron donor  
1581 for anaerobic respiration. *Environ Microbiol* 1999;1:89–98. doi:10.1046/j.1462-  
1582 2920.1999.00009.x.
- 1583 [170] Roden EE, Kappler A, Bauer I, Jiang J, Paul A, Stoesser R, et al. Extracellular  
1584 electron transfer through microbial reduction of solid-phase humic substances.  
1585 *Nat Geosci* 2010;3:417–21. doi:10.1038/ngeo870.
- 1586 [171] Park JH, Kang HJ, Park KH, Park HD. Direct interspecies electron transfer via  
1587 conductive materials: A perspective for anaerobic digestion applications.  
1588 *Bioresour Technol* 2018;254:300–11. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2018.01.095.
- 1589 [172] McGlynn SE, Chadwick GL, Kempes CP, Orphan VJ. Single cell activity reveals  
1590 direct electron transfer in methanotrophic consortia. *Nature* 2015;526:531–5.  
1591 doi:10.1038/nature15512.

- 1592 [173] Lovley DR. Happy together: microbial communities that hook up to swap  
1593 electrons. ISME J 2017;11:327–36. doi:10.1038/ismej.2016.136.
- 1594 [174] Stams AJM, Plugge CM. Electron transfer in syntrophic communities of  
1595 anaerobic bacteria and archaea. Nat Rev Microbiol 2009;7:568–77.  
1596 doi:10.1038/nrmicro2166.
- 1597 [175] Schink B, Thauer R. Energetics of syntrophic methane formation and the  
1598 influence of aggregation. In: Lettinga G, Zehnder, A.J.B. Grotenhuis, J.T.C.  
1599 Hulshoff LW, editors. Granul. Anaerob. sludge; Microbiol. Technol. Proc.  
1600 GASMAT - Work. Lunteren, Netherlands, 25-27 Oct. 1987 , Centre for  
1601 Agricultural Publishing and Documentation; 1988, p. 5–17.
- 1602 [176] Summers ZM, Fogarty HE, Leang C, Franks AE, Malvankar NS, Lovley DR.  
1603 Direct Exchange of Electrons Within Aggregates of an Evolved Syntrophic  
1604 Coculture of Anaerobic Bacteria. Science (80- ) 2010;330:1413–5.  
1605 doi:10.1126/science.1196526.
- 1606 [177] Rotaru AE, Shrestha PM, Liu F, Shrestha M, Shrestha D, Embree M, et al. A new  
1607 model for electron flow during anaerobic digestion: Direct interspecies electron  
1608 transfer to Methanosaeta for the reduction of carbon dioxide to methane. Energy  
1609 Environ Sci 2014;7:408–15. doi:10.1039/c3ee42189a.
- 1610 [178] Rotaru A-E, Shrestha PM, Liu F, Markovaite B, Chen S, Nevin KP, et al. Direct  
1611 interspecies electron transfer between *Geobacter metallireducens* and  
1612 *Methanosarcina barkeri*. Appl Environ Microbiol 2014;80:4599–605.  
1613 doi:10.1128/AEM.00895-14.
- 1614 [179] Liu F, Rotaru A-E, Shrestha PM, Malvankar NS, Nevin KP, Lovley DR.  
1615 Magnetite compensates for the lack of a pilin-associated *c* -type cytochrome in

1616 extracellular electron exchange. *Environ Microbiol* 2015;17:648–55.  
1617 doi:10.1111/1462-2920.12485.

1618 [180] Liu F, Rotaru A-E, Shrestha PM, Malvankar NS, Nevin KP, Lovley DR.  
1619 Promoting direct interspecies electron transfer with activated carbon. *Energy*  
1620 *Environ Sci* 2012;5:8982. doi:10.1039/c2ee22459c.

1621 [181] Barua S, Dhar BR. Advances towards understanding and engineering direct  
1622 interspecies electron transfer in anaerobic digestion. *Bioresour Technol*  
1623 2017;244:698–707. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2017.08.023.

1624 [182] Cheah S, Malone SC, Feik CJ. Speciation of Sulfur in Biochar Produced from  
1625 Pyrolysis and Gasification of Oak and Corn Stover. *Environ Sci Technol*  
1626 2014;48:8474–80. doi:10.1021/es500073r.

1627 [183] Rosas JG, Gómez N, Cara J, Ubalde J, Sort X, Sánchez ME. Assessment of  
1628 sustainable biochar production for carbon abatement from vineyard residues. *J*  
1629 *Anal Appl Pyrolysis* 2015;113:239–47. doi:10.1016/J.JAAP.2015.01.011.

1630 [184] Coelho JJ, Prieto ML, Dowling S, Hennessy A, Casey I, Woodcock T, et al.  
1631 Physical-chemical traits, phytotoxicity and pathogen detection in liquid anaerobic  
1632 digestates. *Waste Manag* 2018;78:8–15. doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2018.05.017.

1633 [185] Di Maria F, Sordi A, Cirulli G, Gigliotti G, Massaccesi L, Cucina M. Co-  
1634 treatment of fruit and vegetable waste in sludge digesters. An analysis of the  
1635 relationship among bio-methane generation, process stability and digestate  
1636 phytotoxicity. *Waste Manag* 2014;34:1603–8.  
1637 doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2014.05.017.

1638 [186] Di Maria F, Gigliotti G, Sordi A, Micale C, Zadra C, Massaccesi L. Hybrid solid  
1639 anaerobic digestion batch: biomethane production and mass recovery from the

- 1640 organic fraction of solid waste. *Waste Manag Res* 2013;31:869–73.  
1641 doi:10.1177/0734242X13477902.
- 1642 [187] Moukazis I, Pelleri FM, Gidakos E. Slaughterhouse by-products treatment  
1643 using anaerobic digestion. *Waste Manag* 2018;71:652–62.  
1644 doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2017.07.009.
- 1645 [188] Fuchs W, Drosig B. Assessment of the state of the art of technologies for the  
1646 processing of digestate residue from anaerobic digesters. *Water Sci Technol*  
1647 2013;67:1984–93. doi:10.2166/wst.2013.075.
- 1648 [189] Vaneeckhaute C, Lebuf V, Michels E, Belia E, Vanrolleghem PA, Tack FMG, et  
1649 al. Nutrient Recovery from Digestate: Systematic Technology Review and  
1650 Product Classification. *Waste and Biomass Valorization* 2017;8:21–40.  
1651 doi:10.1007/s12649-016-9642-x.
- 1652 [190] Egle L, Rechberger H, Zessner M. Overview and description of technologies for  
1653 recovering phosphorus from municipal wastewater. *Resour Conserv Recycl*  
1654 2015;105:325–46. doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2015.09.016.
- 1655 [191] Dahlin J, Nelles M, Herbes C. Biogas digestate management: Evaluating the  
1656 attitudes and perceptions of German gardeners towards digestate-based soil  
1657 amendments. *Resour Conserv Recycl* 2017;118:27–38.  
1658 doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.11.020.
- 1659 [192] Bagreev A, Bandosz TJ, Locke DC. Pore structure and surface chemistry of  
1660 adsorbents obtained by pyrolysis of sewage sludge-derived fertilizer. *Carbon N Y*  
1661 2001;39:1971–9. doi:10.1016/S0008-6223(01)00026-4.
- 1662 [193] Jiang B, Lin Y, Mbog JC. Biochar derived from swine manure digestate and  
1663 applied on the removals of heavy metals and antibiotics. *Bioresour Technol*

- 1664 2018;270:603–11. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2018.08.022.
- 1665 [194] Li J, Zhang M, Ye Z, Yang C. Effect of manganese oxide-modified biochar  
1666 addition on methane production and heavy metal speciation during the anaerobic  
1667 digestion of sewage sludge. *J Environ Sci* 2019;76:267–77.  
1668 doi:10.1016/j.jes.2018.05.009.
- 1669 [195] Zhang L, Li F, Kuroki A, Loh KC, Wang CH, Dai Y, et al. Methane yield  
1670 enhancement of mesophilic and thermophilic anaerobic co-digestion of algal  
1671 biomass and food waste using algal biochar: Semi-continuous operation and  
1672 microbial community analysis. *Bioresour Technol* 2020;302:122892.  
1673 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2020.122892.
- 1674 [196] Martin SL, Clarke ML, Othman M, Ramsden SJ, West HM. Biochar-mediated  
1675 reductions in greenhouse gas emissions from soil amended with anaerobic  
1676 digestates. *Biomass and Bioenergy* 2014;79:39–49.  
1677 doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2015.04.030.
- 1678 [197] Marchetti R, Castelli F. Biochar from Swine Solids and Digestate Influence  
1679 Nutrient Dynamics and Carbon Dioxide Release in Soil. *J Environ Qual*  
1680 2013;42:893–901. doi:10.2134/jeq2012.0352.
- 1681 [198] Mukherjee S, Weihermueller L, Tappe W, Vereecken H, Burauel P. Microbial  
1682 respiration of biochar- and digestate-based mixtures. *Biol Fertil Soils*  
1683 2016;52:151–64. doi:10.1007/s00374-015-1060-x.
- 1684 [199] Cardelli R, Giussani G, Marchini F, Saviozzi A. Short-term effects on soil of  
1685 biogas digestate, biochar and their combinations. *Soil Res* 2018;56:623.  
1686 doi:10.1071/SR18017.
- 1687 [200] Vaughn SF, Eller FJ, Evangelista RL, Moser BR, Lee E, Wagner RE, et al.

- 1688 Evaluation of biochar-anaerobic potato digestate mixtures as renewable  
1689 components of horticultural potting media. *Ind Crops Prod* 2015;65:467–71.  
1690 doi:10.1016/j.indcrop.2014.10.040.
- 1691 [201] Zhang J, Lü F, Shao L, He P. The use of biochar-amended composting to  
1692 improve the humification and degradation of sewage sludge. *Bioresour Technol*  
1693 2014;168:252–8. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2014.02.080.
- 1694 [202] Bustamante MA, Albuquerque JA, Restrepo AP, de la Fuente C, Paredes C,  
1695 Moral R, et al. Co-composting of the solid fraction of anaerobic digestates, to  
1696 obtain added-value materials for use in agriculture. *Biomass and Bioenergy*  
1697 2012;43:26–35. doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2012.04.010.
- 1698 [203] Godlewska P, Schmidt HP, Ok YS, Oleszczuk P. Biochar for composting  
1699 improvement and contaminants reduction. A review. *Bioresour Technol*  
1700 2017;246:193–202. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2017.07.095.
- 1701 [204] Xiao R, Awasthi MK, Li R, Park J, Pensky SM, Wang Q, et al. Recent  
1702 developments in biochar utilization as an additive in organic solid waste  
1703 composting: A review. *Bioresour Technol* 2017;246:203–13.  
1704 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2017.07.090.
- 1705 [205] Sanchez-Monedero MA, Cayuela ML, Roig A, Jindo K, Mondini C, Bolan N.  
1706 Role of biochar as an additive in organic waste composting. *Bioresour Technol*  
1707 2018;247:1155–64. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2017.09.193.
- 1708 [206] Cristina G, Camelin E, Pugliese M, Tommasi T, Fino D. Evaluation of anaerobic  
1709 digestates from sewage sludge as a potential solution for improvement of soil  
1710 fertility. *Waste Manag* 2019;99:122–34. doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2019.08.018.
- 1711 [207] Angelidaki I, Treu L, Tsapekos P, Luo G, Campanaro S, Wenzel H, et al. Biogas

1712 upgrading and utilization: Current status and perspectives. *Biotechnol Adv*  
1713 2018;36:452–66. doi:10.1016/J.BIOTECHADV.2018.01.011.

1714 [208] Browne J, Nizami A-S, Thamsiroj T, Murphy JD. Assessing the cost of biofuel  
1715 production with increasing penetration of the transport fuel market: A case study  
1716 of gaseous biomethane in Ireland. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev* 2011;15:4537–47.  
1717 doi:10.1016/J.RSER.2011.07.098.

1718 [209] Petersson A, WeLLInGer A. Biogas upgrading technologies–developments and  
1719 innovations. *IEA Bioenergy* 2009;20:1–19.

1720 [210] Sun Q, Li H, Yan J, Liu L, Yu Z, Yu X. Selection of appropriate biogas  
1721 upgrading technology-a review of biogas cleaning, upgrading and utilisation.  
1722 *Renew Sustain Energy Rev* 2015;51:521–32. doi:10.1016/J.RSER.2015.06.029.

1723 [211] Miltner M, Makaruk A, Harasek M. Review on available biogas upgrading  
1724 technologies and innovations towards advanced solutions. *J Clean Prod*  
1725 2017;161:1329–37. doi:10.1016/J.JCLEPRO.2017.06.045.

1726 [212] Singh G, Lakhi KS, Sil S, Bhosale S V., Kim IY, Albahily K, et al. Biomass  
1727 derived porous carbon for CO<sub>2</sub> capture. *Carbon N Y* 2019;148:164–86.  
1728 doi:10.1016/j.carbon.2019.03.050.

1729 [213] Ahmed R, Liu G, Yousaf B, Abbas Q, Ullah H, Ali MU. Recent advances in  
1730 carbon-based renewable adsorbent for selective carbon dioxide capture and  
1731 separation-A review. *J Clean Prod* 2020;242:118409.  
1732 doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.118409.

1733 [214] Dissanayake PD, You S, Igalavithana AD, Xia Y, Bhatnagar A, Gupta S, et al.  
1734 Biochar-based adsorbents for carbon dioxide capture: A critical review. *Renew*  
1735 *Sustain Energy Rev* 2020;119:109582. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2019.109582.

- 1736 [215] Sethupathi S, Zhang M, Rajapaksha A, Lee S, Mohamad Nor N, Mohamed A, et  
1737 al. Biochars as Potential Adsorbers of CH<sub>4</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>S. *Sustainability*  
1738 2017;9:121. doi:10.3390/su9010121.
- 1739 [216] Creamer AE, Gao B, Zhang M. Carbon dioxide capture using biochar produced  
1740 from sugarcane bagasse and hickory wood. *Chem Eng J* 2014;249:174–9.  
1741 doi:10.1016/J.CEJ.2014.03.105.
- 1742 [217] Creamer AE, Gao B. Carbon-Based Adsorbents for Postcombustion CO<sub>2</sub>  
1743 Capture: A Critical Review. *Environ Sci Technol* 2016;50:7276–89.  
1744 doi:10.1021/acs.est.6b00627.
- 1745 [218] Presser V, McDonough J, Yeon S-H, Gogotsi Y. Effect of pore size on carbon  
1746 dioxide sorption by carbide derived carbon. *Energy Environ Sci* 2011;4:3059.  
1747 doi:10.1039/c1ee01176f.
- 1748 [219] Xu X, Kan Y, Zhao L, Cao X. Chemical transformation of CO<sub>2</sub> during its  
1749 capture by waste biomass derived biochars. *Environ Pollut* 2016;213:533–40.  
1750 doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2016.03.013.
- 1751 [220] Jung S, Park YK, Kwon EE. Strategic use of biochar for CO<sub>2</sub> capture and  
1752 sequestration. *J CO<sub>2</sub> Util* 2019;32:128–39. doi:10.1016/j.jcou.2019.04.012.
- 1753 [221] Sahota S, Vijay VK, Subbarao PMV, Chandra R, Ghosh P, Shah G, et al.  
1754 Characterization of leaf waste based biochar for cost effective hydrogen sulphide  
1755 removal from biogas. *Bioresour Technol* 2018;250:635–41.  
1756 doi:10.1016/J.BIORTECH.2017.11.093.
- 1757 [222] Kanjanarong J, Giri BS, Jaisi DP, Oliveira FR, Boonsawang P, Chaiprapat S, et  
1758 al. Removal of hydrogen sulfide generated during anaerobic treatment of sulfate-  
1759 laden wastewater using biochar: Evaluation of efficiency and mechanisms.

- 1760 Bioresour Technol 2017;234:115–21. doi:10.1016/J.BIORTECH.2017.03.009.
- 1761 [223] Bamdad H, Hawboldt K, MacQuarrie S. A review on common adsorbents for  
1762 acid gases removal: Focus on biochar. Renew Sustain Energy Rev  
1763 2018;81:1705–20. doi:10.1016/J.RSER.2017.05.261.
- 1764 [224] Sun Y, Zhang JP, Wen C, Zhang L. An enhanced approach for biochar  
1765 preparation using fluidized bed and its application for H<sub>2</sub>S removal. Chem Eng  
1766 Process Process Intensif 2016;104:1–12. doi:10.1016/j.cep.2016.02.006.
- 1767 [225] Xu X, Cao X, Zhao L, Sun T. Comparison of sewage sludge- and pig manure-  
1768 derived biochars for hydrogen sulfide removal. Chemosphere 2014;111:296–303.  
1769 doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2014.04.014.
- 1770 [226] Sun Y, Yang G, Zhang L, Sun Z. Preparation of high performance H<sub>2</sub>S removal  
1771 biochar by direct fluidized bed carbonization using potato peel waste. Process Saf  
1772 Environ Prot 2017;107:281–8. doi:10.1016/j.psep.2017.02.018.
- 1773 [227] Shang G, Shen G, Liu L, Chen Q, Xu Z. Kinetics and mechanisms of hydrogen  
1774 sulfide adsorption by biochars. Bioresour Technol 2013;133:495–9.  
1775 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2013.01.114.
- 1776 [228] Madzaki H, Karimghani WAWAB, Nurzalikharebitanim, Azilbaharialias.  
1777 Carbon Dioxide Adsorption on Sawdust Biochar. Procedia Eng 2016;148:718–  
1778 25. doi:10.1016/j.proeng.2016.06.591.
- 1779 [229] Shahkarami S, Azargohar R, Dalai AK, Soltan J. Breakthrough CO<sub>2</sub> adsorption  
1780 in bio-based activated carbons. J Environ Sci (China) 2015;34:68–76.  
1781 doi:10.1016/j.jes.2015.03.008.
- 1782 [230] Lahijani P, Mohammadi M, Mohamed AR. Metal incorporated biochar as a  
1783 potential adsorbent for high capacity CO<sub>2</sub> capture at ambient condition. J CO<sub>2</sub>

- 1784 Util 2018;26:281–93. doi:10.1016/j.jcou.2018.05.018.
- 1785 [231] Guedes RE, Luna AS, Torres AR. Operating parameters for bio-oil production in  
1786 biomass pyrolysis: A review. *J Anal Appl Pyrolysis* 2018;129:134–49.  
1787 doi:10.1016/j.jaap.2017.11.019.
- 1788 [232] Li W, Dang Q, Brown RC, Laird D, Wright MM. The impacts of biomass  
1789 properties on pyrolysis yields, economic and environmental performance of the  
1790 pyrolysis-bioenergy-biochar platform to carbon negative energy. *Bioresour  
1791 Technol* 2017;241:959–68. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2017.06.049.
- 1792 [233] Ji C, Cheng K, Nayak D, Pan G. Environmental and economic assessment of  
1793 crop residue competitive utilization for biochar, briquette fuel and combined heat  
1794 and power generation. *J Clean Prod* 2018;192:916–23.  
1795 doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.05.026.
- 1796 [234] Harsono SS, Grundman P, Lau LH, Hansen A, Salleh MAM, Meyer-Aurich A, et  
1797 al. Energy balances, greenhouse gas emissions and economics of biochar  
1798 production from palm oil empty fruit bunches. *Resour Conserv Recycl*  
1799 2013;77:108–15. doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2013.04.005.
- 1800 [235] Sahoo K, Bilek E, Bergman R, Mani S. Techno-economic analysis of producing  
1801 solid biofuels and biochar from forest residues using portable systems. *Appl  
1802 Energy* 2019;235:578–90. doi:10.1016/J.APENERGY.2018.10.076.
- 1803 [236] ICIS. Analytics - ICIS Explore 2018.  
1804 [https://www.icis.com/explore/services/analytics/?intcmp=mega-menu-explore-  
1805 services-analytics&redirect=english](https://www.icis.com/explore/services/analytics/?intcmp=mega-menu-explore-services-analytics&redirect=english) (accessed January 2, 2019).
- 1806 [237] Menya E, Olupot PW, Storz H, Lubwama M, Kiros Y. Production and  
1807 performance of activated carbon from rice husks for removal of natural organic

1808 matter from water: A review. *Chem Eng Res Des* 2018;129:271–96.  
1809 doi:10.1016/j.cherd.2017.11.008.

1810 [238] Shabangu S, Woolf D, Fisher EM, Angenent LT, Lehmann J. Techno-economic  
1811 assessment of biomass slow pyrolysis into different biochar and methanol  
1812 concepts. *Fuel* 2014;117:742–8. doi:10.1016/j.fuel.2013.08.053.

1813 [239] Dickinson D, Balduccio L, Buysse J, Ronsse F, van Huylbroeck G, Prins W.  
1814 Cost-benefit analysis of using biochar to improve cereals agriculture. *GCB*  
1815 *Bioenergy* 2015;7:850–64. doi:10.1111/gcbb.12180.

1816 [240] Jirka S, Tomlinson T. State of the biochar industry 2014. A survey of commercial  
1817 activity in the biochar field. 2015.

1818 [241] Jirka S, Tomlinson T. 2013 State of the biochar industry. A Survey of  
1819 commercial activity in the biochar field. 2014.

1820 [242] Antoniou N, Monlau F, Sambusiti C, Ficara E, Barakat A, Zabaniotou A.  
1821 Contribution to Circular Economy options of mixed agricultural wastes  
1822 management: Coupling anaerobic digestion with gasification for enhanced  
1823 energy and material recovery. *J Clean Prod* 2019;209:505–14.  
1824 doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.10.055.

1825 [243] Zhang L, Lim EY, Loh KC, Ok YS, Lee JTE, Shen Y, et al. Biochar enhanced  
1826 thermophilic anaerobic digestion of food waste: Focusing on biochar particle  
1827 size, microbial community analysis and pilot-scale application. *Energy Convers*  
1828 *Manag* 2020;209:112654. doi:10.1016/j.enconman.2020.112654.

1829 [244] Sharifzadeh M, Sadeqzadeh M, Guo M, Borhani TN, Murthy Konda NVSN,  
1830 Garcia MC, et al. The multi-scale challenges of biomass fast pyrolysis and bio-oil  
1831 upgrading: Review of the state of art and future research directions. *Prog Energy*

1832 Combust Sci 2019;71:1–80. doi:10.1016/J.PECS.2018.10.006.

1833 [245] GREET. GREET Models 2018. <https://greet.es.anl.gov/greet.models> (accessed  
1834 January 2, 2019).

1835 [246] EPA U. Overview for Renewable Fuel Standard 2017.

1836 [247] Moreira MT, Noya I, Feijoo G. The prospective use of biochar as adsorption  
1837 matrix – A review from a lifecycle perspective. *Bioresour Technol*  
1838 2017;246:135–41. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2017.08.041.

1839 [248] Mohan D, Sarswat A, Ok YS, Pittman CU. Organic and inorganic contaminants  
1840 removal from water with biochar, a renewable, low cost and sustainable  
1841 adsorbent - A critical review. *Bioresour Technol* 2014;160:191–202.  
1842 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2014.01.120.

1843 [249] Ibarrola R, Shackley S, Hammond J. Pyrolysis biochar systems for recovering  
1844 biodegradable materials: A life cycle carbon assessment. *Waste Manag*  
1845 2012;32:859–68. doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2011.10.005.

1846 [250] Pratt K, Moran D. Evaluating the cost-effectiveness of global biochar mitigation  
1847 potential. *Biomass and Bioenergy* 2010;34:1149–58.  
1848 doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2010.03.004.

1849 [251] Nowrouzi M, Younesi H, Bahramifar N. High efficient carbon dioxide capture  
1850 onto as-synthesized activated carbon by chemical activation of Persian Ironwood  
1851 biomass and the economic pre-feasibility study for scale-up. *J Clean Prod*  
1852 2017;168:499–509. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.09.080.

1853 [252] Muñoz E, Curaqueo G, Cea M, Vera L, Navia R. Environmental hotspots in the  
1854 life cycle of a biochar-soil system. *J Clean Prod* 2017;158:1–7.  
1855 doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.04.163.

- 1856 [253] Hammond J, Shackley S, Sohi S, Brownsort P. Prospective life cycle carbon  
1857 abatement for pyrolysis biochar systems in the UK. *Energy Policy*  
1858 2011;39:2646–55. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2011.02.033.
- 1859 [254] Brassard P, Godbout S, Pelletier F, Raghavan V, Palacios JH. Biomass and  
1860 Bioenergy Pyrolysis of switchgrass in an auger reactor for biochar production : A  
1861 greenhouse gas and energy impacts assessment. *Biomass and Bioenergy*  
1862 2018;116:99–105. doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2018.06.007.
- 1863 [255] Righi S, Bandini V, Marazza D, Baioli F, Torri C, Contin A. Life Cycle  
1864 Assessment of high ligno-cellulosic biomass pyrolysis coupled with anaerobic  
1865 digestion. *Bioresour Technol* 2016;212:245–53.  
1866 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2016.04.052.
- 1867 [256] Matušík J, Hnátková T, Kočí V. Life cycle assessment of biochar-to-soil  
1868 systems: A review. *J Clean Prod* 2020;259. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120998.
- 1869 [257] Hjalila K, Baccar R, Sarrà M, Gasol CM, Blánquez P. Environmental impact  
1870 associated with activated carbon preparation from olive-waste cake via life cycle  
1871 assessment. *J Environ Manage* 2013;130:242–7.  
1872 doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2013.08.061.
- 1873 [258] Kookana RS, Sarmah AK, Van Zwieten L, Krull E, Singh B. Biochar application  
1874 to soil. agronomic and environmental benefits and unintended consequences. vol.  
1875 112. 1st ed. Elsevier Inc.; 2011. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-385538-1.00003-2.
- 1876 [259] Li H, Feng K. Life cycle assessment of the environmental impacts and energy  
1877 efficiency of an integration of sludge anaerobic digestion and pyrolysis. *J Clean*  
1878 *Prod* 2018;195:476–85. doi:10.1016/J.JCLEPRO.2018.05.259.
- 1879  
1880